

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XVI

APRIL, 1931

No. 2

EDITORIAL

EVERYTHING THAT INCREASES OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE nature and work of the Spirit of God is to be welcomed. We are therefore fortunate in having such a student as Rev. R. Birch Hoyle of England contribute various papers upon this theme. In passing, we are pleased to note that this writer is steadily gaining recognition in his own country, and, we believe, in America. He has of late been a leading contributor to *The British Weekly*.

After reading his discussion of Philo's ideas on inspiration, in January, 1930, the student of this vital subject will enjoy the article in this number by Mr. Hoyle, upon *The Paraclete in Tertullian's Writings*. One reason for turning to the views of this early Latin father may be understood from this sentence in the present paper: "The importance of Tertullian's works for understanding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's nature and work will be seen when we recall the fact that he is the first great Latin Christian author to take up such themes and apply them to the perennial problem of the relation between a 'spiritual' church and the half-pagan members newly flocking in."

After a brief consideration of symbols and terms used to designate the Spirit and His work, especially the word Paraclete, and a brief sketch of Tertullian's

life, there are treated in order: The New Prophecy, Spiritual Leadership, Messages of the Paraclete, The New Age of the Spirit, The Nature of the Spirit, The Holy Spirit in the Trinity. The whole study is not only of historical value, but it brings a fresh realization of the place that the Holy Spirit, in His nature and activity, has ever held, and must ever hold, in the consciousness of the church He vitalizes.

LACK OF PERSPECTIVE MAKES FOR CONFUSION. THIS fact alone renders of great value an occasional survey, review or outline of any important matter. We can hardly hope to comprehend a historic movement simply from what has occurred within it and what is said about it in our own time. We must know about its beginnings and what has contributed to its character and influence.

German Rationalism has exerted a profound influence upon modern thought, particularly in the religious field. It is probable that to many the mention of it connotes merely a species of disbelief in the Bible. But that is simply a result; Rationalism's fundamental significance lies in the fact that it organizes the tendency of the natural man to look to reason as the sole means of discovering truth, so that he cannot see the need of revelation. Dr. Neve's survey of *German Rationalism at its First Appearance* gives a very clear idea of how this inherent propensity of humanity, to rely solely on itself, developed among the Germans.

He recognizes that the problem of relating reason and revelation has been a difficult one in the whole history of doctrine; and he traces the struggle in Germany between these ideas, reveals its outcroppings, and briefly cites certain leading thinkers that have partici-

pated in it, giving enough of the ideas of each to identify his position. Kant of course comes in for more attention than anyone else. Call it what we will—Liberalism, Rationalism, Modernism—the church is still at grips with a kind of thinking that does not recognize a God who chooses to reveal Himself directly.

There is given with this paper a good list of learned works that have come of this long controversy, and at the close of his account Dr. Neve adds some observations that gather up briefly the essential points. The reader who has forgotten some of his history or is for any reason hazy upon this matter will be grateful for such a brief yet comprehensive outline.

THE ATHEIST HAS ALWAYS BEEN AMONG US. AT TIMES he becomes a little more vociferous than usual; but is that any reason for giving him serious attention? Stout believers differ as to the answer. The militant theist and the devout Christian feel that faith must assert itself and combat unbelief at every point. Others think that, since this is the day of radical thinking in social, political, economic, and educational matters, it is only natural that the religious radical should raise his strident voice, and that, if we do not dignify his arguments by taking them seriously, he will quiet down. However, when we realize the effect of unbelief upon our student class alone it is not wise to ignore it.

Now there is more than one way of meeting the situation, and these are weighed with care in Mr. Wilson's thoughtful paper, *The Mood of Atheism*. After showing that any such a movement as that fostered by organized atheism in America is not to be dismissed as demanding no serious attention, Mr. Wilson turns first to the actual meaning of atheism. Then follow words

of caution respecting the rights of atheists and the obligation to be just and fair in dealing with them. This passage deserves thought, for history bears ample witness to the extreme bitterness, and the rank injustice and cruelty, of religious quarrels.

Mr. Wilson, himself a devout Christian of most irenic spirit, gives his closing paragraphs to a judicial account of the atheist's position, to the indirect but telling atheism of much of our modern literature and liberalism—a most important point, and to the overwhelming argument furnished by the positive results of Christian faith as compared with the paralyzing effects of unbelief.

IN RECENT DECADES THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION HAS BEEN undergoing profound and even revolutionary changes. While all this involves questions of orthodoxy and Biblical criticism, it must be evident that the theological curriculum, simply as a means to a particular educational end, deserves attention of its own. The Biblical Seminary in New York has been from the first a pioneer in the movement toward a more logical, coherent, and unified curriculum. It has achieved sufficient success, not only to attract unusually favorable attention, but even to be accepted as a model for several schools in the Far East. In view of this fact it is hardly out of place to present in the pages of *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW*, which it publishes, something of the history and character of the curriculum which it has constructed and is consistently seeking to improve.

At one of the Seminary's more recent Founders' Day celebrations, the late Dr. James Coffin Stout, Professor of Church History, delivered an address upon *One of the Problems of a Pioneering Institution*, that

so admirably sets forth the distinguishing features of its curriculum that we publish it in this issue, abridged only by the omission of incidental material.

IN THE EXEGETICAL DEPARTMENT THIS QUARTER WE have two studies. The first, by Dr. Kuist, *The Labors of the Christian Ministry*, is a careful study of certain Greek words which indicate the thought in the minds of New Testament writers respecting the nature of work for the advancement of the Gospel. The papyri are drawn upon, and their value for the better understanding of the Greek New Testament is shown by several illustrations.

Professor Osborn gives us another illuminating paper, this time upon *Second Corinthians 3:12-4:6*. Here is a passage peculiarly appropriate for today, and this brief study of it may suggest more than one sermon.

THERE ARE SEVERAL BOOKS OF MORE THAN ORDINARY value and interest among those reviewed in this issue. All in the list, however, are worth attention:

The Decline of the Medieval Church.—Flick.

The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.—Weber.

Psychologies of 1930.—Murchison.

Who Moved the Stone?—Morison.

The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews.—Fairbairn.

D. L. Moody.—Moody.

Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story.—Andrews.

R. M. K.

THE PARACLETE IN TERTULLIAN'S WRITINGS

By R. BIRCH HOYLE

WRITERS WHO HAVE ATTEMPTED to describe their experiences of the Spirit of God labor under the difficulty of having to use words from ordinary life to express extraordinary transactions. In the Old Testament we find words reminiscent of demonism brought in to describe what happened to a Samson, a Saul, an Elijah, when the Spirit of God "fell upon," "gripped" or "clothed itself with" them. Later on, as in Isaiah, terms suggestive of the action of fluids and drugs are used to indicate the effect of the "Spirit" upon the nervous systems of those whom He visited.

These modes of speech are carried forward into the New Testament, and other symbols are taken in to denote the Spirit—the dove, tongues of flame, fire, light, as well as the original meaning of "spirit," the wind. St. Luke is especially fond of such terms drawn from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, and delights to record visions, trances, and raptures as the mode of the Spirit's acting upon men. St. Paul seldom uses such expressions, the actions of the Spirit being put more personally; the Spirit "teaches," "searches the mind of God," "seals," and "hallows" believers, and "intercedes with God" in prayer. By St. John this latter action is stated of the Spirit under the personal name denoting His office, viz., the *Paraklētos*. Five times that word occurs in Johannine writings. Four times it occurs in the Gospel and describes the Spirit's

work in and for believers (14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7); the fifth is in the First Epistle (2:1) and presents the action of the risen Lord.

The precise equivalent of the Greek word *paraklētos* in other languages has been a problem. The Vulgate simply takes over the word in the Gospel passages, *Paracletus*, but in the Epistle uses *Advocatus*, which corresponds with the Greek meaning, "called in alongside." But Latin writers prior to Jerome, e.g. Tertullian, Novatian, Hilary, when quoting the Gospel passages sometimes use *Advocatus* there, as well as *Paracletus*, and Hilary even uses *Consolator*, which, as consoler, is close in meaning to the English word "Comforter" which has prevailed in English versions since Wyclif's day. Yet Wyclif meant by "Comforter" more than a consoler; to him comfort suggested strengthening, as when he rendered Philippians 4:13, "I maie alle thingis in him that comfortith me." The inadequacy of Comforter to represent *Paraklētos* is seen in the Revised Version, where the margin reads, "or Advocate, or Helper, *Gr.* Paraclete." Dr. Weymouth gives "advocate" in all passages; Dr. Moffatt has Helper in the Gospel, "advocate" in the Epistle. In German Luther gave *Troester* in the Gospel, *Fuersprecher* in the Epistle. The former word has the ordinary meaning of English comforter; the latter word means intercessor. French versions follow Luther, with *Consolateur* and *Avocat*, though the Genevan Pastors' Version (1802) gives *Defenseur* in the Gospel passages.

With reference to the Latin *Advocatus*, it is to be noted that the function the Spirit discharges is wider than that of the Scots term, advocate, the barrister whose interest is limited to his success in presenting a case and pocketing a fee. Asconius gives the sense of

the Roman law courts when he explains the use by Cicero of this word thus: "He who defends another in the courts is called either a Patron, if he is a speaker, or Advocate, if he supplies the law or lends his presence on a friend's behalf" (*In Divinationem ad Q. Caecilium*). Tacitus, seventy years later, said: "It is for the needs of life and its business that the resource of eloquence is required, thanks to which no one for want of an advocate is at the mercy of the powerful" (*Annales* xi, 7). The *advocatus* had a personal interest in the person defended; he was his patron, guardian, instructor, and protector as well as spokesman. This Jesus was to His disciples when He was on earth, and after His withdrawal to Heaven the Spirit, the Paraclete, will be in this relation to His church on earth. And Tertullian, himself a Roman jurist, gives this as the function of the Spirit: "He is an advocate for the purpose of winning over the judge by prayers" (*De Jejuniis* 13). But, as this paper seeks to show, the offices of the Spirit, in Tertullian's writings, cover a wider field and represent an experience which the Christian church ever needs.

The importance of Tertullian's writings for understanding the doctrine of the Holy Spirit's nature and work will be seen when we recall the fact that he is the first great Latin Christian author to take up such themes and apply them to the perennial problem of the relation between a "spiritual" church and the half-pagan members newly flocking in.

Tertullian describes the action of the Spirit within the Montanist movement and deals with principles and ideas such as recur again and again in the course of church history. They appear in Priscillianism in Spain (fourth century), with Joachim de Fiore and the

Fraticelli in Italy (thirteenth century), the Friends of God (fifteenth century), with Zwickau and the Anabaptists (sixteenth century), with Mme. Guyon and the Quietists in France (seventeenth century), with Ranters and Quakers in England (seventeenth century), with Plymouth Brethrenism and Irvingism (nineteenth century). Further, Tertullian laid down the main lines, which Augustine took, of the Western Church's interpretation of the Holy Spirit's relation to the Godhead in the Trinity, and has influenced theology for all time. But before we illustrate these points a few words are needed to sketch the salient features of Tertullian's career and character.

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, the son of a Roman centurion, was born, probably at Carthage, North Africa, about the middle of the second century of our era. He appears to have been trained for the law, was familiar with great Latin classical writers, especially Cicero and Vergil, and was imbued with Stoic philosophy. He wrote and spoke Greek and Latin and displays in his copious works a keen, argumentative brain, a vivid, pregnant, picturesque style. Converted in middle age, he dedicated the force of his glowing mind to the service of the church, defending the faith amid the persecutions of the Roman state and local governors, and withstanding both Jewish and Gnostic opponents of Christianity.

About the beginning of the third century Tertullian adopted the tenets of the Montanists, turned his weapons of eloquence, sarcasm, and fiery invective against the laxity of the rule of bishops and conventional practices within the church, pleaded for a church of "no compromise" against the "world" which was entering the church. He opposed Christians joining the army or

*Tertullian died at Carthage ca 230
was married
he fought Gnosticism, despite his
Christianism*

the teaching professions which took up profane books, also the trades and callings which in any way countenanced idolatry, and the social customs which made divorce easy and gave scope for plural marriages. With Puritan rigor he advocated the duty of fasting, of single marriage, of renunciation of worldly pursuits in the arena and theater, even if it entailed martyrdom, and he stimulated martyrs with his burning zeal. In all this polemical activity Tertullian based his warrant on the actual, contemporary messages of the Paraclete, through "His prophets"—messages compared and explained by the written Word of God, for, like Apollos, Tertullian was "mighty in the scriptures."

THE NEW PROPHECY

In the fifties of the second century a sudden outburst of "prophesying" occurred in Asia Minor, centering round one Montanus and his two women associates, Maximilla and Priscilla (Prisca). The form of prophecy was ecstasy; the person "possessed" by the Spirit was thrown into a trance and uttered messages purporting to be utterances of the Paraclete, using him or her as His mouthpiece.

A saying attributed to Montanus runs: "Behold, the man is as a lyre, and I [the Spirit] fly to it as a plectrum. The man sleeps, but I wake; see, it is the Lord who removes in ecstasy the heart of men and puts a heart in men" (Epiphanius: *Haereses* 48, 4). Another saying reads: "I am the Father and the Son and the Paraclete" (Didymus: *De Trinitate* III, 41. 1, 3). In ecstasy Maximilla says, "Ye should not hear me, but hear Christ; after me prophecy will be no more, but the end [of the world] cometh." Priscilla had a vision: "Christ came to me, moded in shining raiment,

in the form of a woman and revealed to me that this place [Pepuza, Asia Minor] is holy and the Jerusalem from Heaven comes down" (Epiphanius: *Op. cit.* 48, 12, 2; 49, 1). Tertullian seems to allude to the appearance of the holy Jerusalem in a mirage when he writes: "The prophecy has been lately fulfilled, for there was suspended in the sky in Judaea every morning early, for forty days, a city. As the day advanced, the entire figure of its walls would wane gradually, and at times it would vanish instantly." (*Adversus Marcion* iii, 24.)

This new movement, which revived an earlier form of prophecy, predicted the Second Advent, the coming of the New Jerusalem, and "the end of all things." It spread throughout the Roman Empire, creating rival parties and rousing the opposition of the episcopacy, but lately established.

In the south of France there were manifestations in the days of persecution (A.D. 177) akin to Montanism, if not directly promoted by it. Irenaeus tells us: "We hear many of the brethren in the Church who have the prophetic gifts, who speak with tongues through the Spirit and who bring to light the secret things of men and expound the mysteries of God" (Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica* V, 7). In the Letter from the Church at Lyon and Vienne to Asian [Minor] Churches we read of one, Vettius Epagathus, who protested against the injustice of the Roman magistrate towards Christians standing trial. Asked if he too was a Christian, "he confessed and was ranked with the martyrs. He was indeed the *paraclete* of the Christians." The Letter adds: "But he had the Paraclete within, the Holy Spirit, which he proved by the fulness of his love, cheerfully laying down his life for his brethren; for he was,

and still is, a genuine disciple of Christ, following the Lamb whithersoever He goeth" (Eusebius: *Op. cit.* V, 1). Of others it is said that, as "sufferers they were supported by the joy of martyrdom, the hope of the promises, the love of Christ and the Spirit of the Father." "They were not unvisited of God's grace, and the Holy Spirit was their Counsellor." (*Ibid.* V, 1, 3.)

Twenty-five years later Montanism secured a brief recognition from the Bishop of Rome; but Praxeas, against whom Tertullian wrote a book, secured its withdrawal. "After the Bishop of Rome had acknowledged the prophetic gifts of Montanus, Prisca and Maximilla, and thus bestowed peace on the churches of Asia and Phrygia, Praxeas compelled the Bishop to withdraw the letter of peace he had issued. . . . By this he did a service to the Devil in Rome . . . he drove away prophecy . . . he put to flight the Paraclete." (Tertullian: *Adversus Praxean* i.) In Carthage, North Africa, under Tertullian's warm advocacy, the "New Prophecy" had a firmer footing and its most powerful exponent. It even took over his name, and two hundred years later Augustine mentions that their basilica—the Church of the Tertullianists—had passed back again to the custody of the Catholic Church.

The leading features of inspiration which marked Montanism were reproduced in Carthage. "There is a sister here," says Tertullian, "gifted with charismata of revelations which she experiences in church amid the services of the Lord's Day through ecstasy of the Spirit: she converses with angels, sometimes even with the Lord, and sees and hears mysteries and discerns the secrets of hearts and offers healing to those seeking such." The means used to induce the trance state are

“reading of the Scriptures, psalm-singing, or spoken addresses, which furnish material for her visions.” But, unlike the Montanist prophetesses, this sister’s communications were not made till after the public worship was over. (*De Anima* 9.) In this Tertullian was mindful of St. Paul’s counsel concerning the ministry of women; he will not permit a woman “to speak in the church, nor to baptize, nor to offer [the Eucharist], nor to assume any office which belongs to a man” (*De Virginibus Velandis* 9).

For receiving ecstasy the favoring conditions were in sleep, by dreams, or in exalted moods when undergoing martyrdom. “This force by which we dream we call ecstasy—a leaving of the senses, like loss of consciousness.” Like the sleep into which God threw Adam (Gen. 2:21) it induced quiet of body but roused the mind to see the invisible (*De Anima* 45). In the passion of *Perpetua and Felicitas*¹ the visions given by these matrons when in the prison cells and before the wild beasts in the arena are dwelt upon with gusto as proofs of the assistance of the Paraclete. In the Preface the editor writes: “We, who acknowledge and honour both the prophecies [of Scripture] and new visions as equally promised to us, and consider the other powers of the Holy Spirit as building up the Church to which He was sent—we collect new instances of God’s grace to glorify God and strengthen man, so that no despondency of faith or weakness may deem that the Divine grace abode only with the men of old, as regards the worthiness of receiving martyrdoms or revelations.”

These signs were taken as a fulfilment of the promise in Joel, and at Pentecost, of the effusion of the Spirit

¹ Good judges, as Dean Armitage Robinson and Professor Harnack, think this tract was edited by Tertullian himself.

"in the last days." And so when Tertullian counsels martyrs (*i.e.*, testifiers) who were cast into jail he bids them "not to grieve the Holy Spirit who hath entered into prison with you; for if He had not entered now with you, you would not be there this day. . . . Ye are about to undergo the 'good fight,' wherein the President is the Living God, the Trainer, the Holy Spirit, the Crown, Eternity. . . . Your Master, Jesus Christ, hath given you the unction of the Spirit and brought you forth into this wrestling ground." (*Ad Martyres* 1.3.) The Trainer, the Holy Spirit, Tertullian tells us, "incites almost all to go and offer themselves in martyrdom, not to flee from it"; "if anyone recognizes the Spirit he will hear Him branding runaways," and "therefore the Paraclete is necessary who guides into all truth and is the Exhorter unto all endurance. And they who have received Him will neither flee from persecution nor buy it off, for they have the Lord Himself to stand by us to aid us in all sufferings." (*De Fuga in Persecutione* 9.11, 14); for "certainly they who were wont to be led by the Spirit used to be guided by Himself to martyrdoms" (*De Scorpiace* 8).

SPIRITUAL LEADERSHIP

Persons animated by the Paraclete in facing martyrdom are, in Tertullian's opinion, the real leaders and guides of the church, and not the weak-kneed officials who "are equipped for flight from city to city, pastors who are lions in peace time, timid deer in battle" (*De Corona* 1). "When persons in authority," he says, "—the very deacons and presbyters and bishops—take to flight, how will a layman be able to see with what purpose it was said, 'Flee from city to city'?" (*De Fuga* 11). "A

good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep . . . it does not become the keepers of the flock to flee when the wolves invade it" (*ibid.*). And so Tertullian moves to the position that these "new prophets," endowed with the Spirit, are the true counsellors to be heeded, because the Paraclete was ruling the church through them.

The present period of time, to Tertullian, was "the end of the ages." "Now, through the Paraclete, the church is settled into maturity. He will be, after Christ, the only One to be called and revered as Master, for He speaks not from Himself, but what is commanded by Christ. He is the Only Prelate, because He alone succeeds Christ. They who have received Him set truth before custom." (*De Virg. Vel.* 1.) Tertullian directs his scorn against the Bishop of Rome (Callistus, A.D. 217), whom he calls, in irony, "Pontifex Maximus, the Bishop of bishops," for issuing this edict: "I remit, to such as have discharged [the requirements of] repentance, the sins both of adultery and of fornication" (*De Pudicitia* 1). These were the rampant vices of the Roman world, and thus condoned. Not to such a lax minister, but, says Tertullian, "it is to *spiritual* men that this power of remission appertains. . . . For the very church itself, properly and principally, is the Spirit Himself, in whom is the Trinity of the One Deity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The Spirit combines that church which the Lord has made to consist of 'three.' " And "the church, it is true, will forgive sins, but it is the church of the Spirit, by means of spiritual men; not the church which consists of a number of bishops. For the right and arbitrament is the Lord's, not the servant's; God's Himself, not the priest's." (*Ibid.* 21.)

MESSAGES OF THE PARACLETE

The touchstone of a "spiritual" church is ability to recognize the Spirit speaking in the prophets of every age. Tertullian says to those in authority in the then so-called Catholic Church, who claimed "to have received 'another Paraclete' in and through the Apostles," that, "as they do not recognise Him [the Spirit] in His special prophets, they no longer possess Him in the Apostles either" (*De Pudic.* 12). And so the strict discipline of the "spiritual" Montanistic church was based on messages received from the Paraclete Himself. Thus, to the rejoinder of the bishops who said, "The Church has the power to forgive sins," Tertullian replies, that he "has the Paraclete Himself in the persons of the new prophets saying 'I [the Spirit] will not do it, lest they commit others withal' " (*ibid.* 21). He goes on to maintain that "the recognition of charismata entitles the Montanists to be deservedly called 'spiritual' " (*De Monogamia* 1), and reproaches the Catholics for having "rejected the prophecies of the Holy Spirit" and, "by not receiving the Paraclete," having opposed the Montanists (*De Corona* 1; *De Fuga* 1).

And at this point we see most clearly the august offices of the Paraclete and His pervading ethical power. "The Holy Spirit from heaven is the Determiner of discipline itself" (*De Pudic.* 11). It is His purpose "in the way of discipline to lead the Church to a higher perfection. What then is the Paraclete's administrative office but this: the direction of discipline, the revelation of Scripture, the re-formation of the intellect, the advancement toward the 'better things'?" (*Cf.* Hebrews 11:40; 12:24; *De Virg. Vel.* 1.)

Against the sins of the flesh appeal is made to a

“revelation” to Prisca, who said: “Purity makes union with God, and the pure see visions, and bowing down the face they also hear clear voices” (*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 10). Of the lax church practice is a word of the Spirit’s: “The Paraclete well said, through Prisca, ‘They are carnal and hate the flesh’” (*De Resurrectione Carnis* 11). And again, as touching on the vexing question of the veiling of virgins, Tertullian says: “To us [*i.e.*, the Montanists] the Lord has even by revelations measured the space for the veil to extend over”; and he alludes to “a sister of ours being addressed by an angel” giving such instructions (*De Virg. Vel.* 17). Whatever we make of such a passage, we cannot deny that there was a fine instinct of delicacy, an ethical protest against fashions which appealed to lust. And this feeling ruled Tertullian in his fierce fight against re-marriage. Protesting against “multinuptials,” he says: “The spiritual rule which prescribes but one marriage under the Christian obedience is maintained by the authority of the Paraclete, whose prerogative it will be to fix the limit, who had once [in the patriarchs of the Old Testament] been diffuse in His permission” (*Adversus Marcion* I, 29). Here we see the Paraclete guiding to a sure view when the early revelation was to be discarded.

To the laxer Christians, whom, following Paul’s distinction between “spiritual” and “carnal” (*cf.* 1 Cor. 2:14 f.; Rom. 8:12 ff.) he calls “the physics” (carnals), he says: “They raise controversy with the Paraclete: it is on this account that the New Prophecies are rejected: not that Montanus and Maximilla and Priscilla preach another God . . . not that they overturn any particular rule of faith, but that they teach more frequent fasting than marrying.” And Tertullian

justifies separation from the main body of the church, the "psychics," "at the recognition and the defense of the Paraclete" (*De Jejun.* 1; *Adv. Prax.* 1).

Thus all along the line of cleavage—the rejection of the official hierarchy in obedience to the new prophecy; the putting of the Paraclete before the routine of custom and wont; the acceptance of rigorous discipline, led by the Spirit, unto the ethical conduct of life as respects chastity, single marriage, fasting, and willingness to undergo martyrdom rather than purchase escape by deserting the faith—the present guidance of the Spirit, speaking in His second century prophets and prophetesses, was the decisive factor of Tertullian's religious experience.

THE NEW AGE OF THE SPIRIT

Tertullian was of the opinion that this outburst of prophecy in his time was the fulfillment of the Lord's promise to send the Paraclete after His ascension (*John* 16:12 f.). "The reason why the Lord sent the Paraclete was, that, since human mediocrity was unable to take in all things at once, discipline should little by little be directed and ordained and carried to perfection by that Vicar of the Lord, the Holy Spirit" (*De Virg. Vel.* 1). After a charming description of how, in nature, plants grow to maturity, he proceeds: "So, too, righteousness was first in a rudimentary state, having a natural fear of God. From that stage it advanced through the Law and the Prophets [of the O. T.] to infancy. From that stage it passed, through the Gospel, to the fervour of youth. Now, through the Paraclete, it is settling into maturity." (*Ibid.* 1.)

He held that the outpouring at Pentecost was not the full descent of the Spirit; rather, that after John

the Baptist's day the Spirit was withheld. (Cf. *De Anima* 9; *De Jejun.* 12.) He thought that when the Baptist asked, "Art thou he that should come?" the Spirit had already left him: "It was necessary, now that the Lord Himself of all might was operating and preaching on earth, that the portion of the Holy Spirit which, in the form of the prophetic gift, had been through John preparing the way of the Lord, should now depart from John and return back again to the Lord, as to its all-embracing original" (*Adv. Marc.* IV, 18).

In similar manner he argues that the Spirit had left the Jews when the prophecy of Isaiah, that "a flower [*sic. Vulgate*] rising out of the root of Jesse [*Isa.* 11:1-3] had appeared in the flesh. The whole *substance* of the Spirit rested in Christ: after this time the Spirit of the Creator never breathed amongst them." (*Ibid.* V, 8.) He winds up his train of thought thus: "Since, then, the Creator promised the gift of His Spirit in the latter days; and since Christ has in these last days appeared as the Dispenser of spiritual gifts, it clearly follows that this gift of the Spirit belongs to Him who is the Christ of the predictor."

And so Tertullian concluded that his "age of the Spirit" was "the end of all time." So sure was he of the Paraclete's presence that he dares to assert that "Christian discipline dates from the renewing of the Testament [*i.e.*, of the Lord's Supper, *Matt.* 26:28] and from the redemption of the flesh [*i.e.*, the Lord's Passion]. None was perfect before the discovery of the order of faith; none a Christian before the resumption of Christ to Heaven; none holy before the manifestation of the Holy Spirit from Heaven, the Determiner of discipline itself." (*De Pudic.* 11.) Under the tuition

of the Paraclete he claims for himself and his associates that, "By the grace of God we possess an insight into both the times and occasions of the Sacred Scriptures, especially we who are followers of the Paraclete, not of human teachers" (*Adv. Prax.* 13).

By that illumination of the Spirit he feels able to refute the heresies of the "psychics," who, he says, "have corrupted the very Word of God Himself, either by mutilating or misinterpreting the Scripture, and introducing the apocryphal mysteries and blasphemous fables. But yet Almighty God, in His most gracious providence, by pouring out of His Spirit in these last days upon all flesh has checked these impostures of unbelief and perverseness, re-animated men's faltering faith in the resurrection of the flesh, and cleared from all obscurity and equivocation the ancient Scriptures by the clear light of their words and meanings. . . . Through the New Prophecy which descends in copious streams from the Paraclete, He has now dispersed all the perplexities of the past and their self-chosen allegories and parables, by the open and perspicuous explanation of the entire mystery." (*De Resur. Carnis* 63.) That this is no idle boast anyone can prove by reading Tertullian's works against the Gnostics and other heresies.

Not only is there "the re-formation of the mind" under the Paraclete's tuition; the purification of heart was felt. The fervid appeal for Christian holiness is traced to the same source. He says that "holiness is the proper nature of the Holy Spirit; the flesh is taught holiness; of old we were destined for this holiness; nothing of novelty is the Paraclete introducing; the Paraclete is rather its Restitutor than its Institutor" (*De Monog.* 3.4). By His aid men and women could over-

come the "weakness of the flesh." "Hardness of heart reigned till Christ's time; let 'infirmity of flesh' [citing Paul's word] suffice to have reigned till the time of the Paraclete. But the 'hardness of heart' yielded more readily than the 'infirmity of the flesh.' The time for its indulgence was the interval until the Paraclete began His operations, to whose coming were deferred the things which in His day could not 'be endured' [John 16:12]. Now it is no longer competent for anyone to be unable 'to endure,' seeing that He through whom the power of enduring is granted is not lacking. But He has withal promised that 'The Spirit is prompt' [Matt. 26:41, Vulg.] in order that the Spirit may vanquish the flesh, that 'the weak,' the flesh, may yield to the stronger." (*De Monog.* 14.) Here we see how Tertullian interprets "Spirit" as denoting the Heavenly Aider, and not, as moderns, the human spirit.

THE NATURE OF THE SPIRIT

In several passages already cited it will perhaps have been observed that Tertullian speaks of the spirit as if it were a material substance, like to its counterpart, "flesh." Once he explicitly says that "flesh is an earthly, spirit a heavenly, material" (*Ad Uxorem* I, 4). And elsewhere he asks, "Who will deny that God is a body, even if God is a spirit? For spirit is body of its own kind in its likeness" (*Adv. Prax.* 7). We saw that he argued that "since Christ has appeared on earth it was necessary that the 'portion' of the Spirit in the Baptist must now depart and return to its *mass*, the All-embracer, Christ, in whom the whole substance of the Spirit consisted" (*Adv. Marc.* IV, 18; V, 5).

This mode of speech sounds strange to us who are wont to think of "spirit" as the very opposite of matter.

The key to this difficulty is found when we recall that Tertullian was deeply read in Stoic philosophy and brought the Stoic idea of God, as a fine ethereal substance of purest light, and His relation to man, to the service of his thinking as a Christian. When discussing the nature of the human soul he expressly falls back on the view of Zeno, the founder of Stoic philosophy, to prove that the soul implanted in the human body is a spirit and is corporeal substance (cf. *De Anima* 5). The Stoics regarded the nature of God as a kind of fire (cf. "glory," "light," in St. Paul's mode of speech), which permeated the universe, and reached man as "soul," by which he is akin to the other animals, and as "mind," by which he is akin to God. This "spirit" was thought of as the subtlest kind of matter, which is extended, but not severed, from its parent source, and to which it again returns. A Montanist sister, says Tertullian, had actually been visited by a "spirit" which could even be grasped by the hand; it was soft and transparent and of an ethereal color and in form resembled the human form in every respect (cf. *De Anima* 9).

We must not stay to show how inadequate this materialistic view of spirit is to our ways of thought, but it is instructive to note that every kind of philosophy, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, and Neo-platonic, has been brought at times to the service of the Christian mind to enable it to understand itself and God, and still "the half has never been told" of what the Spirit is and the experience of Him means. But the fact of the Spirit's operating remains when these philosophies have "had their day and ceased to be." For, as Tertullian puts the matter, "By whom has truth ever been found without God? By whom has Christ ever been explored without the Holy Spirit? By whom has the Holy

Spirit been attained without the mysterious gift of faith?" (*De Anima* 1.) The experience is always ineffable, too full and deep for human speech.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE TRINITY

The idea of the Spirit as an extension of God, a *continuum* that touches and enters the human soul, is brought into service to explain the doctrine of the Trinity. Tertullian simply claims that his insight was due to the Paraclete's aid (*cf. Adv. Prax.* 2, 13). He was opposing the heresy which took it "that one cannot believe in one only God in any other way than by saying that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the selfsame Person. . . . The numerical order and distribution of the Trinity they assume to be a division of the unity." Against that view Tertullian argues that the "Unity includes the Trinity in that all are of One, by unity of substance; while the mystery of the Oeconomy [*i.e.*, the dispensation of the Three in One] is still guarded, which distributes the Unity into the Trinity, placing in their order the Three—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Three, however, not in condition but in degree; not in substance, but in form; not in power, but in aspect; yet of one substance and of one condition and of one power, inasmuch as He is one God, from whom these degrees and forms and aspects are reckoned under the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." (*Adv. Prax.* 1.)

Tertullian attempts to illustrate this by similes drawn from nature. "God sent forth the Word [the Son] just as the root puts forth the tree, and the fountain the river, and the sun the ray. . . . But still the tree is not severed from the root, nor the river from the fountain, nor the ray from the sun; nor, indeed, is the

Word separated from God. . . . For the root and the tree are distinctly two things, but correlatively joined; the fountain and the river are also two forms, but indivisible; so likewise the sun and the ray are also two forms, but cohering ones. Everything which proceeds from something else must needs be second from that from which it proceeds, without being on that account separated. . . . Now the Spirit is third from God and the Son; just as the fruit is third from the root, or as the stream out of the river is third from the fountain, or as the apex of the ray is third from the sun. Nothing however is alien from that original essence whence it derives its properties." (*Ibid.* 8.) He concludes: "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and each is God" (*ibid.* 13).

We have no space to show how the suggestions of Tertullian were worked out by Augustine to form the doctrine of the Deity of the Paraclete, and the mode of His procession from the Godhead, which the Western churches have ever since held as the right interpretation of this great mystery.

In this Latin Christian's writings we see plainly how "the earthly vessel" of human language is at best a poor vehicle for the transmission of Heavenly realities. One cannot but feel how far short Tertullian falls from the Apostle Paul, when he resorts to the ecstatic form of prophecy to explain the conditions under which the Spirit visits the human mind. But the stern ethical temper of the North African is akin to Paul's and is a bracing tonic in these days of lax marriage ties, easy divorce, indulging in the pleasures of the senses, craving for luxury. The return of the Christian church to its function as the perpetual critic of the world that heeds not God can come only when it partakes of an experi-

ence such as Tertullian enjoyed. We sorely need the Paraclete's presence and activity. Happily signs are not wanting—as witness the “theology of crisis” of the school of Barth, the researches of the “Kairos” school around Tillich of Darmstadt, the re-emergence of Soeren Kierkegaard's thoughts from Denmark—that the church universal is moving back to “the hills whence her life rose” for new streams of power. Tertullian in his day knew the source of strength and happy will the church be when she has an experience like his. “If you will only draw water from the fountains of the Paraclete,” he says, “you will never thirst for other teaching; no feverish craving after subtle questions will again consume you; you will be satisfied with the refreshing draughts” (*De Res. Carn. ad fin.*).

KINGSTON-ON-THAMES, ENGLAND.

GERMAN RATIONALISM AT ITS FIRST APPEARANCE

By DR. J. L. NEVE, Professor of History of Christian Doctrine, Hamma
Divinity School, Wittenberg College

BY "RATIONALISM" in this article we do not mean, of course, that well known philosophical principle in the field of the theory of knowledge; but we mean by it the specifically German movement in the history of Protestant theology which we are accustomed to consider in line with Deism in England and with Naturalism in France. In English these three movements are spoken of as the "Enlightenment."

We might speak of Rationalism in a number of respects. E. Troeltsch in his article on *Aufklaerung* in the *Protestantische Realencyklopaedie* (vol. II, 226 ff.)¹ and E. C. Moore, on the basis of this article, in his book, *Christian Thought Since Kant* (pp. 27-29) have shown us the influence of Rationalism in various spheres of human life. Carl Girgensohn in a brilliantly conceived lecture, *Geistesgeschichtliche Lage der Gegenwart* (1924), refers to four other fields of operation of the rationalistic principle: Mathematics and the natural sciences, politics, practical economics, and ethics. Here we shall deal with theological Rationalism. In the history of all positive religions we observe theological Rationalism in the most varying forms. There was Rationalism in the church long before it appeared in the Renaissance and the theology of the enlightenment in the eighteenth century. One needs only to think of

¹ Cf. article, Enlightenment, *New Schaff-Herzog*.

the Monarchians and the Gnostics in the ancient church, of Duns Scotus in the Middle Ages, and of the Socinians in the age of the Reformation.

1. All through the history of doctrine there has been the problem of properly relating reason and revelation. Both revelation and reason had been accepted as sources of Christian truth. This was also the case in the theological systems of the Lutherans and Reformed in the seventeenth century. The Lutherans distinguished between articles of faith which have their source in both reason and revelation, like the general belief in God and immortality, and such articles as rest purely on revelation. The dividing line between these two sources, however, was never absolutely defined, and reason succeeded more and more in gaining ground in the foundation of Christian doctrine.

2. In this direction moved that peculiar type of Supernaturalism, into which orthodoxy had issued at the beginning of the eighteenth century. It maintained itself along with Rationalism during the whole of the eighteenth century and even during the first part of the nineteenth.² This Supernaturalism labored to prove by rational means the possibility, necessity, and reality of the leading contents of supernatural revelation. Representatives of the older type were men such as Storr, Reinhard, Planck, Knapp, and Staedlin. It was a type of theology that bore the marks of a period of transition. Truth was to be proved by Scripture. But in the conception of the Scriptures these Supernaturalists were much guided by Toellner's ideas of inspiration, by Semler's criticisms, and by Ernesti's exegesis. The idea was that, not reason, but Scripture was to decide in matters of religion; but, as to what is the teaching of

² Cf. Kurtz: *Church History*, English ed., vol. III, sec. 171, 6.

Scripture, reason was taken to be the most important guide. If Rationalism reminded us of Socinianism, Supernaturalism had a resemblance to Arminianism. The Trinity, the two natures of Christ, and the mystical union were not denied, but neither were they emphasized. Christ was the Redeemer, but He was subordinated to the Father. The fall of man was replaced by a mere inclination to evil and correspondingly there were Pelagian elements in the teachings about the way of salvation. There was variation in the teaching on the work of the Holy Spirit.³

Thus reason was given the decisive influence in establishing the reality and the contents of revelation. But in this way, where the rational principle had been gaining more and more the upper hand over the supernatural, Supernaturalism was moving unconsciously in the direction of Socinianism. So it can be said of this older Supernaturalism that it became more and more a feeder of Rationalism. The Supernaturalism here described must not be confused with the so-called "Pietistic Supernaturalism" of the middle of the nineteenth century, with representatives such as Neander, Tholuck, and Hengstenberg, in which we have a determined aim at the overthrow of Rationalism.⁴

3. To describe the essential features of this theological Rationalism we may say that it was for Germany the result of the *Aufklaerung* as a general movement, that recrudescence of the tendencies that characterized the Renaissance, which for a time had been checked by the Reformation, but now came back again with an irresistible force.

This "Modernism" of Germany was simply the

³ Cf. Kahnis: *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus*, fourth ed. (1874), vol. II, p. 119.

⁴ See Kurtz: *Church History*, Eng. ed., vol. III, sec. 182, 4.

working out of principles in modern philosophy. Since Descartes, rational thinking had been elevated to the principle of all theoretical knowledge of truth and of all practical moral action. This was applied to God and to ethics, especially by Spinoza. In Holland, England, and France most of the thinkers aimed to arrive at all knowledge of truth, including religious truth, from the accessible sources in this world. If there was a recognition of "revelation" then it was a "natural revelation." Most of these philosophers, excepting Spinoza who was not yet understood, and the whole general civilization still held to the faith in a personal God. In France alone we find atheism. Of course, the accomplishment of the God of these intellectuals was merely the creation of the world, developed on the basis of its own laws. In this "Deism," as it was called in England, there was no room for the supernatural. Still, there was an inclination to enter into a certain alliance with Christianity and revelation.

In Germany it was Leibnitz (d. 1716) who endeavored to mediate between rational Deism and the supernatural revelation of Christianity. He was of the opinion that the existence of an omnipotent and all-wise God can be positively proved by reason. This God created the best of all possible worlds. The evil in this world was not positively bad, but something negative, merely lacking in the perfect good, and thus it was taken to be aiding the development of the good. Leibnitz represents a positive optimism in his estimate of world and man. By this he blazes the trail for a fundamental trait in the modern age, especially in Rationalism. This optimism enters into a decided opposition to the pessimism produced by the doctrine of sin that had been held by conservative Protestantism. The positive dogmas

of Christianity, while not forced by reason, appeared to Leibnitz as being not against reason, but rather "above reason" (*uebervernunftig*). Thus he aimed to mediate between Rationalism and Supernaturalism and to create a kind of super-rationalism.

Christian Wolff (d. 1754) popularized these thoughts. He was the real philosophical founder of the theological Rationalism in its first period, before Kant. It was Wolff who formulated the rational proofs for faith in a personal God and a personal immortality. He preached the need of a practical and humane morality which was to secure temporal and an eternal happiness. Theoretically he did not deny a Christian revelation "above reason," but this revelation must harmonize with natural religion and can be real only in so far as this is done.

In the course of the further development the strength of this supernatural revelation was reduced more and more and identified with the contents of a natural religion. Reimarus (d. 1768), in the so-called *Wolfenbuettel Fragments*, published by Lessing, declined every special revelation and made natural religion the criterion of every historical religion, including Christianity. At the same time he sought critically to dissolve the historic foundation of Christianity as we have it in the Bible. He insisted upon the late conception of the Biblical books and pointed to numerous contradictions, especially in the reports concerning the resurrection of Christ by which he wanted to make this fact incredible.⁵

4. Theology in the various branches labored concretely and consistently to carry out these principles.⁶

⁵ Cf. Walker: *A History of the Christian Church*, p. 526.

⁶ See Troeltsch: *Aufklaerung (PRE)* and *New Schaff-Herzog*.

Biblical criticism and history of doctrine took their beginning. Exegesis became more and more grammatical (Ernesti) and strove to find the "natural" meaning of the Scriptures. The canon lost its authoritative formation and appeared as the result of human development. Dogma appeared as a changing factor, in itself contradictory to and in conflict with, reason. The investigations in these fields by men such as Semler, Michaelis, Sack, Teller, Spalding, Toellner, Jerusalem, were aiming throughout at practical and moral purposes. The effect upon the pulpit, upon hymnology, and liturgy was soon felt.⁷

The dogmaticians attacked the traditional doctrines such as miracle, inspiration, predestination, and original sin. Toellner denied the meritoriousness of Christ's active obedience; Ernesti, the doctrine of His three offices, leaving only that of teacher. In the place of justification by faith there was put the ethical accomplishment. Not, however, until the end of the eighteenth century do we meet consistent works of rationalistic dogmatics. They were strongly influenced by the impressions that were received from Kant's *Critique within the Limits of Pure Reason*. These works on dogmatics wanted to show that the moral religion of reason and Biblical revelation are identical. The aim was apologetical, namely, to prove the maintainability of Christianity. So Tieftrunk, Grabbe, Eckermann, and Wegscheider.

5. The influence of Kant (d. 1804) deserves special attention. It is true, on the one hand, that Kant through his *Critique of Theoretical Reason* upset the self-confidence of the Rationalists, especially their proofs of the

⁷ See characterization of a moderate Rationalist such as J. S. Semler, by Walker: *Church History*, p. 529.

existence of God and of immortality. But, on the other hand, through his *Critique of Practical Reason* he strengthened the confidence of the age in rationalistic moralism as the real essence of Christianity. And especially in his essay on *Religion within the Limits of Pure Reason* (1793) he set himself the task of a complete reconstruction of religion after the principles of that rationalistic moralism. This publication became typical especially of the second form of Rationalism and exercised an influence far beyond the age here under discussion. Its teachings are living in Germany's "New Protestantism" (*Neuprotestantismus*) and in the "Modernism" of today. The fundamental thoughts of this publication present a characteristic picture of Rationalism. Let us review briefly the contents of this essay.

In religion, according to Kant, we are confronted with an exclusively moral problem, namely, with the struggle between the good and the evil principle for dominion over man. The evil principle consists in the turning of the impulses for human action into a direction in which the sensually selfish motives are crowding out the respect for the moral law. This evil principle (*radikale Böse*) has its roots in the will. The inclination of man to evil, when there was an original and even a persevering aptitude or disposition for the good, remains inexplicable.

The redemption from the evil in man can be effected by powers of his own. For here the statement must be valid: *Du kannst, denn du sollst* (Thou canst, therefore thou must). Here is the very point of division between the religion of reason and the religion of revelation, between the religion within the limits of pure reason and the religion which on the basis of Scripture

ventures beyond these limits. It is on the basis of man's inability to make himself good that the faith in the gracious influences of God establishes itself. And this faith stands in contradiction to the religion of reason. Reason affirms auto-redemption—man can make himself good by the strength and powers of his own will. Such is Kant's moral rationalism.

This position necessitated for Kant the abandoning and reinterpretation of all the metaphysical and historical elements of the Biblical doctrine of redemption. We begin with his conception of the person of Christ. Jesus was to him merely the significance and an individual embodiment of the ethical ideal of the human race. He was the descended image of God or prototype (*Urbild*) of the human race. His historic life is nothing but the symbol and the expression of an ideal human life. "The ideal of a race pleasing to God cannot be thought otherwise than under the idea of a man who was willing not only to do man's whole duty, which would include the spreading of the largest amount of good in his environment, but who had also the willingness, in spite of great temptations to the contrary, to pass through all sufferings to the most shameful death for the best of the world, even for his enemies."⁸

Jesus consequently is the symbolical embodiment of man morally tested in labor as well as in suffering. In this He had not vicariously suffered for our guilt nor rendered a moral obedience in our stead; He had simply given an example which we should follow in like situations. Faith in the Son of God as a moral ideal is practical, but faith in the Son of God as a worker of miracles is, according to Kant, without any practical or religious value. Consequently all supernatural and historical

⁸ Works, Reclam, German standard ed., vol. III, 69.

traits in the picture of Jesus are either passed by or declined.

The moral regeneration, or the victory of the good principle, is to be realized, not merely in the individual man, but in human society. A Kingdom of God, or a society established upon moral laws, is to arise. (Reclam, p. 121.) The Christian church is to be converted into such a society for the cultivation of virtue. "The gradual transition of the faith of the Church to the unlimited rule of the faith of pure religion is the approach to the Kingdom of God" (p. 157).

Kant, then, undertook to transform the faith of the church into the faith of reason. We can observe this in his dealing with all the subjects of interest for religion. Scripture is to be reinterpreted in entire conformity with the principles of morality. (P. 149 ff.) Specifically religious tenets of Christianity, such as justification by faith and prayer, are rejected. "Anything outside of a virtuous life that man may think that he can do in order to please God is nothing but religious delusion and a pseudo-service of God" (p. 245). "Prayer, thought of as an inwardly performed service and as a means of grace, is a superstitious delusion, the working of a fetish" (p. 284). We see how consistently Kant had proceeded; not only the supernatural and the historical elements of Christianity are dissolved in their entirety, but also the negative consequences of moral Christianity are all drawn. This position of Kant became normative for Rationalism in theology.⁹

6. The reconstruction of the church's doctrine after the principles of Rationalism was systematically carried out by J. F. Roehr in Weimar in his *Letters on Ra-*

⁹ For a fuller description of Kant's religion, by quotations from his writings, see R. H. Gruetzmacher's *Teatbuch*, referred to.

tionalism (1813).¹⁰ On this basis we can give a brief review of the dogmatics of Rationalism in its matured form.

Roehr declares reason to be the only principle out of which the religio-moral convictions must be developed. Reason also is the criterion for understanding and estimating the old supernatural sources of traditional dogmatics. "Rationalism follows reason entirely and considers the Scriptures as a collection of religious documents produced purely by man's reason; the teachings and statements of these must be left to the critical examination and the verdict of reason" (*Letters*, p. 2).

Next to reason, morality was taken to be a determining and positively constructive principle. Kahnis thus describes the dogmatics of Rationalism: "While to confessional theology the Scriptures as God's Word is the norm of all truth, to Rationalism it was reason [formal principle]; while to the Confessions, justification by faith in Jesus Christ is the fundamental principle, to Rationalism, it was virtue [material principle]."¹¹

Clarity is the criterion of truth. The one thing that is absolutely clear is the duty to lead a moral life. If so, then there must be a God, and our being must mean something for a future life. This was the same idea that had been expressed by the Deists in England and by most of the Naturalists in France. This was to be harmonized with Scripture which can contain no supernatural teachings, no real revelation. Roehr said: "Rationalism leaves everything to take care of itself or dismisses what does not seem to have the character of a universal teaching and does not stand in an immediate relation with the highest purpose of morality." All

¹⁰ See, on Roehr, the church histories and encyclopedias.

¹¹ Kahnis: *Op. cit.*, vol. II, 102.

supernatural traits of the Bible are dismissed as matter characteristic of the times. The teachings of the church are either neutralized or declined. Stripped of what is local or temporary there is nothing of religious truth that the reason of man cannot find out of itself. In this connection attention must be called to the typical rationalistic exegete of the New Testament, H. E. G. Paulus, who, a nonbeliever as to miracles, worked miracles in his art of accommodating the tenets of Rationalism to the text of the New Testament reports.¹²

The position of Christ in the dogmatics of Rationalism is formulated by Roehr negatively when he says that Jesus ceases to be the "object" of religion; he is only its "subject" in the double significance of teacher and ethical example. As soon as Roehr has made this statement, however, he proceeds at once to attribute to Jesus a singular position in the history of religion: "Rationalism reveres in Jesus a man sent by God as a teacher of truth in the customary meaning of this expression. He was a man in whose life and mission [*Schicksal*] Providence worked itself out in a select way." (*Letters*, p. 16.) "Jesus was man like ourselves in the fullest and in a comprehensive meaning of that term, a natural product of his people and his age, but in regard to spirit, wisdom, virtue, and religion excelled by no mortal of the past or future, a hero of humanity in the highest sense" (p. 26). "The historical elements of his life are not without value, but they are means to make the religious teachings real, comprehensible, and interesting for the most common mind" (p. 33). The Christology of Rationalism as a whole represented a radicalism far in excess of Ebionitism and Socinianism.

To the Rationalists the death of Christ was nothing

¹² See Kurtz: *Church History*, vol. III, sec. 182, 2; Meusel: *Kirchl. Handlexikon*, vol. V, 195 f.

but an historical event. Wegscheider suggested that, to accommodate ourselves to the ideas of the weak, we might speak of Christ's death as a symbol of the dismissal of sacrifices, or as an expression of the love of God. Never should there be a suggestion of a vicarious significance, but rather should we urge the betterment of men's lives and the need of a restitution on the part of man.

The church was only a human institution, but a distinct proof of a divine Providence, intended to make accessible for man the Master's ethical religion of reason. The sacraments of the church were, of course, nothing but symbols.

CLOSING OBSERVATIONS

Rationalism, in one respect, has been fittingly judged as a reaction to the extreme intellectualism that ruled the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century as expressed in the theology of the Wittenberg theologians at the end of the syncretistic controversies. While admitting that Tholuck's judgment of these men in his book, *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs* (1852), was one-sided, it cannot be denied that the detailed doctrinal definitions, such for instance as were voiced by Abraham Calovius in his *Consensus Repetitus* (1664), which went far beyond the Formula of Concord, were bound to result in the reaction that was experienced in Rationalism. The emphasis shifted from the intellect to the will.¹³ Phillip Schaff calls attention to the fact that Rationalism was the natural result of an age that worked to an extreme in dogmatics, polemics, and apologetics, but neglected exegesis. The theology of the seventeenth century in its constant conflict, especially with Calvin-

¹³ For reading on this subject the writer refers to his book, *The Lutherans in the Movements for Church Union*, 1921, p. 105 ff.

ism, bled itself to death. In the end the interest subsided, and the springs for rejuvenation of dogmatic theology ran dry. The stagnation was seen in the inability to detect theological problems and to employ historical methods.¹⁴

The chief explanation of Rationalism, of course, lies in the rise of a modern philosophy which produced a large stimulation of humanistic thought. But the application of this humanism to the field of theology, in the vulgar Rationalism of that day, was Pelagianism of the baldest kind, without any concession to synergism, not to mention Augustinianism. Man is prevailingly good by nature; at any rate he possesses the moral powers to suppress the evil and thereby to make himself pleasing to God.

The utilitarian and eudemonistic character of this new religion was very conspicuous. The interest was in individual or social well-being, losing itself thereby in the most absurd trivialities. We are reminded of the adulteration of the hymns and of absurdities in the pulpit. There was little interest in moral action as such; all had to be for a practical purpose. This called forth the criticism of Kant.

In Christology this Rationalism was "Jesus-centric," but no longer "Christo-centric." The distinction between Christ, the God-man, and Jesus, the ideal man (*Idealmensch*), began to be discussed. Jesus was not to be taken as the object, but just as the subject, of our faith.

The church ceased to be a divine institution established for leading souls to salvation through the means of grace, and it was converted into an ethical-religious school for the moral education of man.

¹⁴ Cf. *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. I, 105 ff.

On the final disintegration of Rationalism, R. Seeberg, in *Die Kirche Deutschlands in neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, has this interesting remark: "When tendencies and schools finally have achieved the much coveted dominion over their antagonist then, as a rule, their days are numbered" (p. 15). This has proved to be true in many a case. Thus it happened with the old "vulgar rationalism." A development set in which spelled the defeat of Rationalism all along the line. Kant himself, a contributor to a religion of reason with ethical interests as the sole content, showed at the same time the impotency of reason in dealing with problems of religion which are ever bound to occupy the interest of the religious man. Among the philosophers it was especially Jacobi, a man claiming to be "a pagan with his head, but with his heart a Christian," who labored to take religion out of the confines of pure reason and to discover it in the depth of the inner soul, thus stimulating a longing that was becoming quenched under the cold system of Rationalism. Even a man like Lessing, if we succeed in reducing his seemingly anti-Christian language to its real purpose and intention, wanted simply to make clear that the truth of Christianity does not depend upon external proofs, but must rest upon inner experience. Defective or incomplete as such a position was it contributed to disestablishing that Rationalism of pure reason.

The brilliant church historian, K. A. von Hase, though himself fittingly styled an "aesthetic rationalist," wrote in 1837 his articles against Roehr, and by doing this is credited with having dealt the deathblow to vulgar rationalism.¹⁵ When in 1826 Tholuck changed his professorship from Berlin to Halle it was the philosopher

¹⁵ See in the works of Hase (12 vols., Leipzig, 1890-93) his *Anti-Roehr*, vol. VIII, sec. 1, 35-414.

Hegel who, in his speech at a farewell banquet, called to Tholuck to carry to the *rationalismus vulgaris* in Halle a *pereat*. Already before this time a revived Pietism had sprung up against the religious barrenness of Rationalism, exercising a deep influence upon many, especially upon the theologians of the younger generation. Many of them identified themselves in theology with that school of mediating theologians of which we shall hear later.

And, last, but not least, it must not be thought that the old Lutheranism as a theology was dead. At first it came back in the form of a "repristination" of the theology of the seventeenth century, as Lutheran historians of our modern times have liked to call it—Claus Harms, Hengstenberg, Guericke, Rudelbach, Philippi, Vilmar, Loehe, Kliefoth, *et al.*—and it continued in a new way in the Erlangen school. At this point it is to be emphasized that the revived Lutheranism of the second third of the nineteenth century in exegesis, Biblical introduction, and dogmatics had a great deal to do with the overthrow of Rationalism.

But is it correct to speak of a real "overthrow of Rationalism"? Are not the rationalistic principles in the ascendancy today? In conservative quarters there are churchmen who think and act as if Rationalism is on its deathbed and all that is necessary is to wait patiently until it breathes its last. Schaff wrote thirty years ago: "Fortunately, the power of this great modern apostasy has been broken in the nineteenth century by an extensive revival of the principles of the Reformation" (*Creeds of Christendom*, vol. I, 353). But it is seen more and more, and especially after every new phase in the development of Protestant theology, that this attitude is too optimistic. Rationalism will

always be with us as the constantly negating element (*der Geist der stets verneint*), occasionally, it is true, with a mission for a further purification of conservative theology. But never must it become a controlling factor.

The struggles of the church against Rationalism in the past have always yielded the conviction that its program works to a large extent with Utopias which, in the form here aimed at, cannot be realized. The deepest thinkers of the ages always have and always will arrive at the conviction that the world of spirit can neither be penetrated nor be comprehended by the powers of human reason. And what a failure Rationalism has been in defending, through the actual facts of life, the dogma of the innate goodness of man and the claim that by ethical education and enlightenment he can be made good and happy. What a fundamental depravity of human nature we have seen, even in this modern age, in the crushing of the men of small business by the big corporations, in the rivalry between the business interests of contending nations, in the wars of the last century as a result of these conflicts, in the exploiting of all the backward peoples in their natural innocence and political helplessness. What a condition of the natural man is reflected by the atrocities of the moving armies in these wars, what cruelties by the methods of colonization and by the forcing of the natives under the yoke of their oppressors. We might go on and speak of organized avariciousness in our so-called Christian countries, of the manifestations of materialism on every hand. But let us stop. History surely has rendered a spectacle of the sinfulness of man that stands in absolute contradiction to the dream of the rationalistic moralists. We are reminded of the reply that Frederick

the Great gave to a rationalistic clergyman who praised the natural goodness of man: "*Er kennt die Kanaille nicht.*" This is well translated by saying: You do not know the beast in man. Surely, Rationalism will always be a force, but it is a force of negation bound to suffer defeat in the end, no matter what its contribution to scientific theology in its various branches at times may be.

LITERATURE

The standard church histories, especially of German authorship; see also the histories by Ph. Schaff and W. Walker. The article *Aufklaerung*, by E. Troeltsch, in the third edition of the *Protestantische Realencyklopaedie* (PRE), vol. II, 224 ff.; cf. the article Enlightenment in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia* (NSH), vol. IV, 141 ff. See also the article *Rationalismus und Aufklaerung*, by O. Kirn in the PRE, vol. XVI, 447 ff.; cf. the same article in the NSH, vol. IX, 393 ff. A. Saintes: *Historie Critique du Rationalisme en Allemagne*, 1841; the same in English translation, *Critical History of Rationalism in Germany*, 1849. The writings of F. A. G. Tholuck on rationalism: *Vermischte Schriften*, vol. II, 1839, 1-147; his *Vorgeschichte des Rationalismus*, in four volumes, 1853-62; finally his *Geschichte des Rationalismus*, vol. I, 1865. K. F. A. Kahnis: *Der innere Gang des deutschen Protestantismus*, third ed., 1874, vol. II, 101-123. F. Lichtenberger: *History of German Theology in the 19th Century* (translation from the French, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1889), 18-45. R. Seeberg: *Die Kirche Deutschlands im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, second ed., 1904. E. C. Moore: *History of Christian Thought Since Kant*, 1912. K. Girgensohn: *Geistesgeschichtliche Lage der Gegenwart*, 1924. E. Kant: *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Vernunft*, 1793; cf. an English translation. The essay just named is of special importance for the subject here under discussion; see the topical sketching of it by R. H. Gruetzmacher: *Textbuch zur systematischen Theologie und ihrer Geschichte*, second ed., 1923, 162 ff. F. Roehr: *Briefe ueber den Rationalismus*, 1913; on this particular exponent of the old German rationalism (vulgar rationalism) compare the works of K. A. von Hase, especially his *Anti-Roehr*, vol. V, 1890, 35-414.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

THE MOOD OF ATHEISM

By P. WHITWELL WILSON

FROM TIME TO TIME there appears in the press a casual reference to the literature, the rhetoric, and the organization of atheism in the United States. Most people endowed with common sense pass over these paragraphs without worrying themselves very much over the issue thus raised. Holding that atheism as a cult is no more than a scarcely reputable aberration of the disordered and antisocial intelligence, we turn to some topic of more immediate significance.

On the surface there is a good deal to be said for this attitude of contemptuous indifference. Survey the universities, colleges, churches, cathedrals, banks, and stores which contribute their spires and pinnacles to the incomparable skyline of Manhattan Island. What evidence is there that the atheist error is to be taken seriously? If you wish to discover the headquarters of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism you must make your way to a narrow flight of stairs in an old building on Fourteenth Street, at the top of which there is an office, secluded and modest, where is carried on a propaganda obviously limited to a kind of sortie against the assumptions accepted by the community.

But is it wise to gaze only at the skyscraper, and ignore the backstairs? Not once nor twice in history has the upper room served as a broadcasting station from which a mighty influence has radiated. It was from an upper room that the Pentecostal Gospel was

proclaimed, and it was from rooms no more pretentious than this on Fourteenth Street that determined men set forth to establish what has become the Federated Soviets of Communist Russia. The importance of no society is to be judged by its numbers and material resources. According to our faith is it unto us, and no faith, whatever be its merits or demerits, has ever been a negligible factor in human affairs.

WHAT IS ATHEISM?

In examining a phenomenon, thus controversial, it is well to begin with a clear definition of the term which we are discussing. The word atheist is not English. It is a direct translation of the Greek, and it means a man who has reached a conclusion which, though definite, is negative. A theist asserts God. An atheist denies Him. Faced by what Carlyle calls the "everlasting yea," he replies with what he claims to be his everlasting nay. There never has been, so he says, there is not now, nor ever will there be, a Supreme Being.

In its implications the word atheist is thus more formidable by far than any of the words with which it is apt to be confused. A rationalist is a man who depends on reason only; but all rationalists are not atheists. For the reason of many men has convinced them of God. So with the skeptic. The true skeptic is not a man who insists on denial. He is the Thomas among the apostles who declares that, without the evidence of his eyes and fingers, he is unable to attain to faith. When the father of the demoniac boy cried, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief," he was praying for strength to overcome skepticism. Similarly the atheist far surpasses what Huxley meant by his word agnostic. For the agnostic does not deny God. He merely says that by

the processes of his perception he cannot determine, one way or the other, whether God is a reality.

Indeed, little as he is sometimes aware of it, there was agnosticism in ancient Scripture times, long before there was agnosticism in modern science. It was not Huxley, but Job, who first put the eternal question, "Canst thou by searching find out God?" And it was the prophet Isaiah who exclaimed, "Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself." The late Sir William Harcourt used to say grimly, "Nowadays we are all of us Socialists." There is a sense in which we are all of us agnostics. The Supreme Being far transcends our utmost thought. But it is never wise to quote a text of the Bible and leave anything out. Isaiah did not say, "Verily, thou art a God that hidest thyself," and stop there. He added, "O God of Israel, the Saviour." There is a corrective of agnosticism. It is the Incarnation—the hidden God made manifest in the flesh. To the agnostics of Athens, who had raised their altar to the "unknown God," Paul could say, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you."

In the use of the word atheist, therefore, we need to be precisely accurate. The very fact that a controversy is involved which, inevitably and profoundly, stirs our feelings should make us the more careful of the language that we employ.

For thousands of years, there has been an endeavor to crush atheism. A word, intended to be the vehicle of an idea, has been hurled hither and thither as a missile of abuse. To say that a man from whom the majority differs in conviction or prejudice is an atheist has been as satisfying an insult as to call him a radical or a Bolshevik or an anarchist or a nihilist. Even in the Middle Ages an insinuation of witchcraft was not more deadly.

These strong sentiments have been reflected in an immense volume of laws against blasphemy and of proceedings against the citizen under those laws. Indeed, the administration of such laws has been accompanied by terrible miscarriages of justice. With the mob hot-foot on what, in effect, was to be a lynching, many persons of lofty aspirations and of blameless character have been accused of atheism, not because they disbelieved in Deity as such, but because they dissented from the conception of Deity which happened to be current in their day.

Socrates had no use for the legendary gods of the Greeks, and Plato tells us that he was condemned for atheism. Our Lord Himself, who foretold a reverence for the Father that would surpass all temples made with hands, whether at Jerusalem or Samaria, was indicted on charges of blasphemy akin to atheism. When Polycarp, so accused, was burned alive, he pointed his finger at the crowd and insisted that the real atheists were they who put him to death. The fact that the early Christians were martyred as atheists because they refused to offer incense to idols, has been dramatized by George Bernard Shaw in his play, *Androcles and the Lion*. In our own times there are Roman and Orthodox Catholics to whom the Quaker, in his refusal of all sacraments, baptism included, seems to be no better than an atheist, yet the witness of the Quaker to the Deity is singularly clear and direct.

To students in colleges, to the more advanced leaders of trade unions, to the intellectuals in clubs, especially women's clubs, and last but not least, to the supporters of an institution like the Guild Theater, these precedents are familiar. There is thus an immense and varied public, not specifically atheist, which, none the less, is un-

alarmed by the label. With vigilant and none too friendly eyes this public watches how, in the twentieth century, an unpopular minority is treated. It reads the fierce lines of Shelley:

Spirit. I was an infant when my mother went
To see an atheist burned. She took me there.
The dark-robed priests were met around the pile;
The multitude was gazing silently;
And, as the culprit passed with dauntless mien,
Tempered disdain in his unfaltering eye,
Mixed with a quiet smile, shone calmly forth.
The thirsty fire crept round his manly limbs;
His resolute eyes were scorched to blindness soon;
His death-pang rent my heart! The insensate mob
Uttered a cry of triumph, and I wept.
"Weep not, child!" cried my mother, "for that man
Has said 'There is no God.'"
Fairy. There *is* no God!
Nature confirms the faith his death-groan sealed.

THE ANTIDOTE FOR ATHEISM

Against atheists, therefore, we should be on our guard lest we use any argument that is not scrupulously fair. The citizen should be careful lest, inadvertently, his zeal should lead him to infringe the freedom which is the lifebreath of the Republic. The Christian should pray ever for that love which is the lifebreath of the Redeemer. It is by winning the mind and soul of the atheist that, after all, the citizen and the Christian as partners can eliminate most surely the dangers of atheism as a system.

First, the atheist, as a citizen, must be permitted to enjoy his just rights. According to the first amendment to the Constitution, there should be no "abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble"; and according to the Fourteenth Amendment, no state in the Union shall

“deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.” The meaning of these noble pronouncements has been emphasized by the venerable Justice Holmes in words, delivered in the Supreme Court, which are already classic: “If there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other, it is the principle of free thought; not free thought for those who agree with us, but freedom for the thought we hate.” It is to vindicate this principle that the American Civil Liberties Association has been called into existence.

The restrictions on immigration are specific. No alien will be admitted to the United States except on a declaration that he does not “practice polygamy or believe in or advocate the practice of polygamy,” and there is a ban on “anarchists or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the United State or of all forms of law or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government.” But it will be noticed that these disqualifications do not include atheism or even the economic doctrine known as communism. The alien immigrant is debarred from two things only: First, a certain domestic custom which is incompatible with the home; and a certain belief which disintegrates the state, however the state be constituted.

But the holding of an opinion is one thing; the manner of expressing it is another. To say that anybody may put his point of view in any language he pleases, is to commit ourselves to a far-reaching proposition in the consideration of which we need to be especially clear in our minds as to the position.

The church and the state are allies. But if they are not opponents, neither are they identical. The state has divested itself of all responsibility for the beliefs and administration of the church. Similarly, the church must never be drawn into a blanket approval or endorsement of whatever, good or bad, is done by the state.

According to the belief of the church, man is suffering from a world-wide rebellion of his will comprehended in the word sin. This rebellion is a disease of which atheism is one of many fevers. In its superfluity of violence this fever may lead to a delirium that distresses us by its blasphemous irreverence. But, however blasphemous, however irreverent, it is still delirium, and no doctor argues with delirium. Our Lord was the Great Physician, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again . . . but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." It was by healing the disease that our Lord alleviated its delirium and so left the sufferer "sitting and clothed and in his right mind."

The Christian should bear in mind that there is something which makes men atheists. There was no more religious dynasty than the Hapsburgs of Austria. Yet on one famous occasion Gladstone himself, a great churchman, was provoked into declaring that Austria was "the negation of God." Whenever the church is slothful or unfaithful or inequitable or subservient it drives people into atheism. The antidote for atheism is a Christian discipleship which reveals truly and without distortion the inner mind of the Saviour.

POSITION OF THE STATE

We must not be surprised if the state cannot take, or has not taken, this view. Let us offer an illustration. India is a land of many and diverse faiths. We might

be inclined to say, therefore, that in India every faith should be allowed to express itself without restraint. It happened that a year or two ago a Hindu amused himself by publishing a pamphlet entitled *Rangila Rasul*, or The Gay Prophet, which dealt in outspoken fashion with the domesticities of Mohammed, and why not? As Justice Holmes would say, the Moslems should tolerate even those opinions which they "hate." But the attacks on the Prophet raised riots in India and provoked war on the northwest frontier. Freedom of epithet and freedom of anecdote here meant insurrection.

It is thus a circumstance, curious and interesting, that Great Britain has retained her laws against blasphemy. In the endeavor to get rid of them there was proposed a bill, only a year ago, providing that no criminal proceedings shall be instituted in any court against any person for schism, heresy, blasphemy, blasphemous libel or, be it noted, atheism. In the House of Commons the second reading was carried, but only by 131 votes to 77, and that after a sharp discussion in which the rejection was moved by a Labor member, Mr. Lovat-Fraser, nor was it suggested that the bill, as it stood, could pass by general consent.

Why was the bill opposed? It was not because atheism as a creed was put under a ban. It was because it was held that the expression of this belief ought not to offend against decency so as to "wound or shock" a reasonable mind. Reference was made to the latest prosecution which had been pressed against an atheist called Gott, of whom Mr. Lovat-Fraser gave this account: "I did not say he was a foulmouthed man, but a foulmouthed assailant of Christianity, which is vastly different." The blasphemy laws are held to be a re-

straint, possibly an illogical restraint, on extravagance of vocabulary.

As in England, so in America, there are still states of the Union, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts among them, where blasphemy laws have never been repealed, but are to this day put into force. Not long ago a Boston judge issued a warrant against Professor Horace M. Kallen because he likened the anarchist beliefs of Sacco and Vanzetti to the teachings of our Lord and of Socrates. In Reading, Pennsylvania, an aged witness, refusing to swear on the Bible ejaculated, "To hell with that," and was indicted. The jury, however, acquitted him. Charles Smith himself, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, when opposing the anti-evolution law of Arkansas, was arrested twice, once for "conduct calculated to cause a breach of the peace," for which he was fined twenty-five dollars, and again for blasphemy.

The question, whether the state strengthens its foundations by such legal proceedings, cannot be argued here except in general terms. To the "liberal," as he is called, the prosecutions are merely one more instance of the ancient intolerance which dies hard and has always made every state that indulges in it look ridiculous and revengeful. But to the "conservative" an occasional prosecution of this kind acts as a traffic light that tells the atheist he must not go too fast or too far. Which-ever view be taken, these legalities do not assist and ought not to involve the church.

If any citizen, whether he be an atheist or anybody else, be put on trial, it should be a fair trial. Any suggestion of prejudice against the accused person should be avoided as a betrayal of the very axioms of justice. Here it is that we encounter an old tradition of the com-

mon law which manifestly weights the scales. It was held to be obvious that a person devoid of religion could not be relied upon to give trustworthy evidence in court. As late as the year 1899, so it seems, only twelve states had abolished this disqualification. By the year 1928 the number had increased to twenty-three; but in certain states the anomaly continues.

There have been two recent instances of the application of this law, in which the results were startling. Prosecuted in Arkansas, Charles Smith, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism, was not permitted to give testimony on his own behalf. The very nature of the charge against him prevented him from replying to it. Then there was the case at Gastonia in North Carolina.

Into the nature and merits of certain trials we need not enter. It is enough to say that they involved a number of prisoners whose views of life, here and hereafter, were extreme. The decision of Judge Stack, as reported, was that "a man can believe anything and still be truthful and honest." Atheist evidence was thus accepted by him, like other evidence, for what it was worth on its intrinsic merits.

There was a judge, however, who took a different view. A number of prisoners were charged with murder. The wife of one of them was a young woman of twenty years, called Edith Saunders Miller. As a wife trying to save her husband she was a partial witness, but her evidence, whatever value was to be attached to it, was *prima facie* relevant. Yet on the sole ground that she held atheist opinions that evidence was in effect quashed by the court. Of this ruling, there has been throughout the country a storm of disapproval. In defense of it Judge M. V. Barnhill bases himself on the

doctrine of moral responsibility which, as he rightly holds, is inherent in Christianity. "If," said he, "I believed that life ends with death and that there is no punishment after death, I would be less apt to tell the truth." Let us admit that this may be the case. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of veracity as of other wisdom, and the knowledge that he must meet his Maker has deterred many a man from offenses which otherwise he would have committed. But to assert that, as a matter of law, every atheist is to be disbelieved, merely because he does not look forward consciously to a future life, is to reflect upon the truthfulness of innumerable men and women who have been implicitly trusted and have never betrayed the trust.

ORIGINS OF THE ATHEIST MOOD

The psychologist does not need to be told that the human mind has its moods, or that its prevailing mood may be determined by circumstances, of which education is one. For millions of boys and girls, the prevailing mood used to be acquiescence. They were taught to obey, and they did obey. The mood of the moment in this new world is not acquiescence but initiative. The very fact that a custom, a tradition, a belief has stood the test of time, and, indeed, eternity, is a reason why it should be tested afresh. We are as the Athenians who "spend their time in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing."

On such students at such colleges an event like the Gastonia case has more effect than a thousand pamphlets issued by a thousand associations for the advancement of atheism. For at once the student seizes Judge Barnhill's guns and turns them on Judge Barnhill. If atheists cannot be believed, what about Christians?

Have they always told the truth? Obliterating distinctions between Catholic and Protestant, the student draws up an indictment, ranging from the false decretals to the penal laws in Ireland, from evolution in Tennessee, as he sees it, to Al Capone. It is a *tu quoque* to which it is not easy to supply an answer. The only answer is humility. They who profess and call themselves Christians are too often no more than Christians in name. They who deserve the name cannot but exclaim with Browning, "How very hard it is to be a Christian," and with Chesterton, "Christianity has not failed; it has never been tried." The confession is made clear in the words, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." It is repeated in hymns like that of Watts beginning,

Not all the blood of beasts
On Jewish altars slain,
Could give the guilty conscience peace,
Or wash away the stain.

It is emphasized in the litany, "Have mercy upon us miserable sinners," and in "a Commination or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners." Indeed, a casual inquirer into the creeds and customs of Christians, as recorded, the penances and the penitent forms, the confessionals and the conversions, might come to the conclusion that these believers are obsessed by no other idea than the idea of sinning. If this be the case with the "saints" and fathers of the church themselves, we confess that we are among those who would wish to esteem others better than ourselves. In particular, the Christian would do well to emulate the care with which certain atheists have learned their case. If the believer knew as much about his beliefs as

the doubter knows about his doubts, we would not need to be anxious greatly about the defense of the faith.

THE ISSUE IN PERSPECTIVE

It is in a perspective which includes the ultimate that we should see this issue. What is the aim of life? Let us state it in terms to which everyone of decent mind will agree: Life should be a persistent quest for whatever is better than the good, until finally we reach the best. If this be so, it follows that no second best is good enough. The question is not how believers or unbelievers stand in the presence of one another. It is how they stand before a judgment seat that rises above and beyond them both. The case for Christianity is not decided by professing Christians and churches. It does not depend on creeds and ceremonies. It is determined by Christ Himself. He is the Foundation Stone on which all else rests. In the witness box, He is "the faithful witness," and it is with none other than Him that the atheist and Christian alike must settle the account.

It is possible that this controversy is entering on a new phase. Hitherto, Christianity, even in a world not Christian, has been regarded, in terms of politics, as the government in office. The blame for everything that goes wrong—war, poverty, crime—has been put on the churches, and especially by those who seldom go to church. This has meant that the atheist, in his attacks on Christianity, has enjoyed what strategists call the advantage of the offensive. To indulge in a phrase, familiar to the crowds in the Yale bowl, it has been the atheists' ball. But that is today no longer the situation. Few governments even call themselves Christian, and there are many governments that are definitely anti-

Christian. Over the large territory of Russia an official atheism is autocrat; it has accepted responsibility for human happiness.

Every creed is severely tested when it obtains ascendancy. Atheists have made much of the failure, as they regard it, of Catholicism in the Middle Ages, and of the later failure alleged against Protestantism; but what about the ascendancy of Bolshevism? Atheists have attacked the creeds; but what creed has ever been so emptily mechanical, so coldly defiant of the best mind as the godless creed of Russia? Atheists have derided superstition; but what superstition anywhere has been so degraded and degrading as the spectacular adoration of the embalmed Lenin? Atheists have challenged infallibility; but what pope has ever claimed an infallibility compared with the experimental vacillations of a Soviet Republic, which reverses its own decisions without admitting an error, and by means of the Cheka and Ogpu suppresses all criticism? Atheists have issued a typical pamphlet entitled *Thumbscrew and Rack*, with pictures, which describes "torture instruments employed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries for the promulgation of Christianity." But what instruments of torture, whether in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries or at any other time, have been more terrible than the methods of repression to which atheism in Russia has resorted? It is not atheism that today is fighting for liberty of conscience. It is Christianity. In China, in Turkey, in Russia, the church stands for the elemental rights of the soul.

To atheism and Christianity, then, let us apply precisely the same ultimate test. Let us agree that both of these movements, when in a minority, challenged abuses. Let us further admit that, in both cases, the

iconoclastic period was merely preliminary, the house-wrecker clearing the site for a subsequent building. Let us concede still further that, in the erection of this building, there has been in both cases a rough discipline over the individual. On these assumptions, to which no atheist can take exception, how are we to judge of the results? Let us overlook the means and turn our eyes to the ends.

JUDGING BY RESULTS

The Catholic era produced the greatest art that the world has ever known, and it was an art inspired by faith. It laid the foundations of all modern music that is worth hearing, and its architecture, ecclesiastical, military, and domestic, was unsurpassed. The mosque of the Moslem, the Taj Mahal itself, are indirectly of this Christianity, and apart from Christianity would never have existed. The Protestant centuries have yielded a rich harvest. Discovery, science, missions, healing, education, social reforms, political liberty—all these blessings have accompanied the opening and the reading of the Scriptures and the freedom to worship according to the conscience.

What has been the contribution of atheism? It mastered France, and on the high altar of Notre Dame, the Goddess of Reason was enthroned. In the last hundred years has France produced one building comparable with her Sainte Chapelle, one picture comparable with a Madonna by Bellini, one poem comparable with Dante's *Divine Comedy*, one life comparable with the life of Joan of Arc? If she has, can atheism claim the credit?

Atheism has mastered Russia, and we shall see what we shall see. At the moment the Soviet is proceeding with what is called the Five Year Plan. Let us suppose

that it fulfills all her hopes. Even in that unlikely event, the success would be limited wholly to the material. There would be so much agricultural produce and so much industry. No provision for the spiritual is so much as suggested. On that plane Russia has to be, like Islam throughout the centuries, a mendicant. She has borrowed whatever money she could obtain, whatever mechanics; and she has also borrowed ideas, either from the past or from her neighbors. By a curious irony the Soviet Republic is, as it were, embezzling the very pictures which were the product of the faith which communism denounces, and is selling them in order to obtain funds with which communism, in its desperation, may be financed.

At the headquarters of atheism in the United States we purchased a picture Bible produced by this cult. It would not be easy to discover anywhere, not even in the museum at Brussels where the painter Wiertz exposed the insanity of his genius, a more pitiful confession of humorless satire than these crude caricatures. It is not only that they are denials of God. They are insults to the intelligence of man. They are juvenile without being primitive. For the primitive artist is a genuine child who will grow to man's estate. But these pictures display the saddening maturity of an arrested development. They are the worst because they are the best that the perpetrator will ever be able to achieve. It is preposterous that we should be asked to surrender our Raphaels and Giotto's, our Memlincs and Titians, in order to offend our taste by gazing at monstrosities of ugly irreverence in which every hint of higher motive, of love, of peace, of joy, every charm of poetry and exquisite symbolism, have been trampled in the mire of a relentless malice.

PSEUDO-ATHEISM

It is doubtful whether anybody has ever been either a hundred per cent. Christian or a hundred per cent. atheist. Whether in good or evil, all of us fall short of perfection. But between the two cases there is this important distinction. A Christian may be compelled to say with St. Paul, "Not as though I had already attained"; yet he adds, "I press toward the mark." The atheist, on the other hand, is not quite sure whether he wishes to attain. He stands on the brink of that abyss which is full of darkness; but he shrinks from the plunge. The Psalmist may have discovered "the fool who said in his heart, There is no God." But even this fool did not proclaim his folly from the housetops. The story of the atheist who hung up the motto, "God is nowhere," only to find that, to his dying eyes, it could be read, "God is now here," is typical of a general situation. It recalls the case of the newsboy on lower Broadway who, peering through his bit of smoked glass at the total eclipse of the sun, exclaimed, "And then the — fools say there is no God!"

Of pseudo-atheism we might give an interesting illustration. At the offices of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism we purchased examples of the literature there to be obtained. It included the sermons of an eloquent minister of the Unitarian persuasion. What was the burden of these discourses, or some of them? He defended atheists by using the curious plea that they did not believe in their own atheism, and he gave many instances. Bruno, he said, was accused of atheism, yet "was one of the earliest of the Christian thinkers to work out a consistent philosophy of the divine immanence." Spinoza, expelled from his church as an atheist, was, in reality, "the God-

intoxicated man," to whom the Deity "is the essential heart of all things," apart from whom "nothing exists." Voltaire, held to be "a typical Atheist," declared: "If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent Him; but all nature cries out to us that He must exist." Also, he built the little chapel at Geneva with the inscription, *Deo erexit Voltaire*, "erected by Voltaire to God." Even Kant, "the first man to prove, by means of a relentless logic, that all the so-called proofs of the existence of God are fallacious," also laid it down, "that without the postulates of God, Immortality and Free Will, not only life but thought is impossible." Even Tom Paine left a pamphlet entitled *Atheism Refuted in a Discourse to Prove the Existence of God*, while H. G. Wells has given us a book, *God the Invisible King*.

If, indeed, the number of avowed atheists in the United States, compared with the total population, is small, if the certitude of their convictions is questionable, the reason surely is obvious. Atheism is not a glory that abides. It is a gesture that ends in the air. Let us suppose that Shelley's taunt was provoked by a generous indignation. Even so, it was no more than a taunt.

But consider Pippa as, in Browning's poem, she passed on her way. In his pride of intellect the atheist doubtless would dismiss Pippa as a merely illiterate girl of the village. Yet on her one holiday in the year she could sing, "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." So with the veritable miracle of music that floods the air at Christmas. What atheist ever thought of building organs and training choirs to thunder forth the hymn, 'Praise my soul, no king's in heaven; to his feet no tribute bring'? By destroying Fatherhood, we get rid of sonship, and even a son who has quarrelled

with his father does not rejoice to learn that he is an orphan.

The disease of paralysis may approach its victim in two ways. It may strike him with a sudden shock. It may creep into his system gradually, proceeding from nerve to nerve and from sinew to sinew until the entire being is helpless. So is it with a paralysis of the soul. Atheism is not only a startling error; it is a stealthy and remorseless atrophy. The number of classified atheists may be small, their intellectual eminence may not be impressive; but their view of life, in its essentials, may pervade a widespread community and sterilize many a life that might have been fruitful.

INDIRECT ATHEISM

The avowed atheist has the courage of his convictions. He believes, and he declares the belief, that this universe was created and is now maintained without the exercise of any universal mind. At least we know where he stands and can weigh his *reductio ad absurdum* at its true value.

But there are other promulgators of atheism who make their points by what lawyers call indirection. They suggest the negative that they do not think it prudent to assert. Like Mr. Wells they allude to the Deity as "Mr. G." Like Mr. Mencken they include the Deity in a "treatise on the gods." Without denying the existence of God in express terms, there are many writers who reduce the Almighty to "a point of view." The Creator is discussed as the creation of the creatures whom He created.

All books of this kind are atheist in tendency. They are more potent in their appeal than undiluted atheism. The verbal cleverness and slapdash erudition are merely the protective coloring with which the pill is coated. An

alert and attentive mind can see through the envelope to the actuality of the message it contains. But not every mind is attentive and alert. There are many intellectuals who are dazzled and confused by the legerdemain of authors whose only chance of producing a best seller is to outpace other authors in the race for sensation.

The dismissal of the Deity into the outer darkness of nescience is condoned by a specious plausibility. It is not admitted to be atheism. It is described rather as "the new humanism," and thus Humanism has become the "liberal" faith of many Christians and many Jews. "What doth the Lord require of thee"—so reads the proof text of the Humanist—"but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" If the Humanist were true to his text, he would not be far from the Kingdom of Heaven. But as a rule he does not admit that any god requires anything of him. Numbers of Jews tell us that Moses at the burning bush and Elijah on Mount Carmel are mere legends. By them God and eternity are dismissed from the mortal life as unknowable. Let man do his duty to his fellow man and leave the things of the spirit to take care of themselves. Sufficient unto the day are the opportunities and the obligations thereof.

If ever there were a Humanist, it was Jesus of Nazareth. There was nothing that the Son of Man was not prepared to suffer if thereby His fellow man might be served and saved. In His day, as in ours, there were Sadducees who said that "there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit." If those Sadducees had been right Christ would have associated Himself with them. But He held aloof; indeed, it was the Sadducees who, as Humanists, joined with the Pharisees in the demand

for His crucifixion. Christ though Humanist was thus Deist. Deliberately He rejected any limitation of life to the visible and the immediate. How could it have been otherwise? To Christ, God is love. As Son of God, our Lord is the gift of Love to the world. To deny God would be to repudiate Love and to substitute for it an alternative.

Our Lord was never deceived by fair words. He looked at the heart and found it to be deceitful and desperately wicked. Is the impulse towards atheism inspired by altruistic, ethical, and intellectual motives? When has the Father of all prevented any Humanist from helping that Father's children? On the contrary, St. John asked the question, how any man, failing to love the brother whom he has seen, could love God whom He has not seen.

ABOVE ALL A PERSONAL MATTER

Neither theism nor atheism is, like a theorem in Euclid, to be regarded as an abstract proposition. There is here stated or denied a fact which, like marriage or death, is of urgent importance to the individual.

The historian calmly discusses the question whether Buddha ever existed, nor is there any reason why he should get "hot under the collar" whatever be the decision on the point. But let us suppose that there were a suggestion at some cultured club to elect a re-incarnate Buddha as president, with absolute power over all members at all times. The debate would in that event be no mere formality. That is a faint illustration of the inner meaning of the latent atheism that pervades the world today. The existence of God differs from every other existence. It differs because God's existence means God's companionship and the acceptance of God's control. "Whither," asks the Psalmist, "shall I

flee from his presence?" There was no place where God was not, and the only formula of escape from God is, therefore, to deny outright that there has ever been a God. The depreciation of prayer, the ridicule of miracles, the challenge to inspiration, the onslaughts against the clergy, the struggle against creeds and ceremonies, the caricature of evangelism—all these varying phenomena are included in the comprehensive attempt to establish life on a godless basis.

In discussing the question, whether God exists, there is no such thing, then, as a guidance by pure reason. All reason is the instrument of man's will, and many advocates of reason have been among the most unreasonable exponents of it in their personal lives. The real question is not, whether there is a God, but, whether we are willing to obey Him. The carnal mind, said St. Paul, "is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be," and in other words our Lord proclaimed the same clear truth: "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." The price of Christ's theism is high. God is to be loved "with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." The price of Christ's humanism is no less formidable. He demands that a man love his neighbor as himself. On the other hand, to be without God is to be without hope in the world. It is to be aliens from the commonwealth and strangers from the covenants of promise. A man has thus to choose. It is not a choice merely between yes and no. The real choice is between will and won't.

The offices of the American Association for the Advancement of Atheism are not the only feature of interest on Fourteenth Street. There is also the great building which includes the headquarters of the Salva-

tion Army, a building that seethes with social service. It includes as much humanism as any edifice in the world. It is as full of brotherhood as any commune that ever was conceived in the revolutionary mind. But it does not exclude God. Facing the worst in life, these Salvationists dare to believe in the best. They endure poverty; they relieve poverty. But their souls echo with prayer and praise. They see death; but they know resurrection. They do not cloak sin; but they achieve holiness. Let the enquiring mind, before it reaches the final decision, consider the whole of the evidence.

A former colleague of the writer, an editor of a great London daily paper with a million circulation, was moved one day to help the poor whose homes had been flooded by an overflow of the River Thames. He was brought into touch with the Salvation Army. A mind accustomed to handling secular news was convinced by what he saw that the Gospel is indeed the power of God unto salvation, and he incorporated his experiences in a book called *God in the Slums*. The volume fascinated alike the believer and the unbeliever. It was rapturously reviewed in the press, religious and irreligious. Already the sale in England alone has reached 120,000 copies. Let the atheist read that book. If he is able to prove to his own satisfaction that there is no God in the churches and temples, no God in the creeds and the catechism, no God in the Bible and the prayer book, he will still have to explain what it was that Hugh Redwood found in the slums. Main Street, as surveyed by a Sinclair, is faced by Mean Street, as surveyed by a soul, greater than Sinclair admits that the soul can be, and Mean Street is found to be a sanctuary.

NEW YORK.

ONE OF THE PROBLEMS OF A PIONEERING INSTITUTION

By the Late PROFESSOR JAMES COFFIN STOUT, D.D., Professor of Church History in The Biblical Seminary in New York

THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY is a pioneering institution. The only valid reason for its organization at the first, as well as for its present right to continue, is found in that which marks it out as a pioneer. And on this occasion, vividly interesting because of many historic memories, I ask you to consider a single aspect of the obligation which throughout the years has faced our beloved institution, and to analyze its method of meeting the challenge of its responsibility.

THE OBLIGATION

Every pioneering movement, from the very nature of the case, must acknowledge and give answer to an inescapable question—a question so determinative in its importance that inability to silence its adverse implications will jeopardize all possibility of high success. The question is this: What is the relation of this innovating institution to that which has been proven to be valuable in the past history of similar enterprises? Does it conserve time-tested values, or does it sacrifice them? Does it build up, or does it tear down? Are its pioneering features, when viewed in the light of its fine heritage from the past, constructive, or destructive?

Let me illustrate the fundamental significance of this principle from one of the epoch marking moments in the life of our American nation. Professor John

Fiske has a fascinatingly interesting book entitled *The Critical Period of American History*, in which phrase reference is made to those years which succeeded the close of the Revolutionary War and led up to the final ratification of the new Federal Constitution by the legislatures or conventions of the several colonies. Something new, an adventure in democracy, a pioneering movement in national government, was being initiated. Professor Fiske quotes Gladstone's doubtless unexpectedly enthusiastic statement, that "the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," and himself characterizes it as "the finest specimen of constructive statesmanship that the world has ever seen." He calls it "this Iliad, or Parthenon, or Fifth Symphony of Statesmanship." (Preface, p. vii, and p. 223.)

Why then, if this new instrument of government was worthy of such praise, were the years which led to its formulation and adoption "the critical period of American history"? Why was it not instantly accepted and acclaimed by the exhausted, war-wearied colonies? The answer is found in the very principle to which I am calling attention. Here is the question, about which debate raged: Was this new type of centralized, federated government prejudicial to those rights of independent local self-government unto the maintenance of which the devoted men and women of the colonies had given their blood and their treasure during the bitter years which were punctuated by Bunker Hill and Trenton, Saratoga and Valley Forge? Did this Federal Constitution conserve the fruits of the heroic struggle, or was their heritage from "the times that tried men's souls" to be sacrificed on the altar of this new federal idea? However good this idea was in itself, however

seemingly essential to the welfare of the new nation, it was felt that it was bound to fail if it disregarded the achievements and the experience of the past.

And its successful answer to this imperative question was that which has given permanent value to our national Constitution. Here, as Professor Fiske says, "was realized the sublime conception of a nation in which every citizen lives under two complete and well-rounded systems of laws—the state law and the federal law—moving one within the other, noiselessly and without friction" (p. 301). That is, here was the innovating, pioneering idea with its magnificent vision for the future, expressed in the federal law; and here was also the heritage from the past, safeguarded by the state law. As Professor Fiske truly says, "it was one of the longest reaches of constructive statesmanship ever known in the world" (p. 301).

Now, this is the point of view from which I ask you to consider The Biblical Seminary on this Founders' Day anniversary. It is a pioneer. Does it also conserve? And, in particular, I would like to bring this all-important question to a focus at a single point, namely, on the problem of curriculum. The Biblical Seminary offers a new type of education for those who are accepting the call to religious leadership; does it also take cognizance of that which experience in this field of education has proved to be valuable? In the development of its course of study it innovates, perhaps quite radically innovates; does it also maintain the time-tested elements of a properly organized theological curriculum? And if so, how?

After nearly seventeen years of more or less intimate observation as a member of the Faculty, the differential of The Biblical Seminary seems to me to have two essen-

tial and complementary characteristics: First, its unique emphasis on the study of the English Bible; and second, its creation of a theologically adequate Bible-centered curriculum. Moreover, these two factors must be considered as inseparable.

Not the study of the English Bible alone, but the study of the English Bible plus a curriculum at once Bible-centered and theologically adequate, and the studies both in the Bible and also in all other subjects so conducted as to meet the tests of competent scholarship—this, it seems to me, is the pioneering idea of The Biblical Seminary.

Now, this presents a problem, a very real problem. Is such a Bible-centered, theologically adequate curriculum possible of construction?

A PROBLEM SOLVED

The jealous guarding of the emphasis on the mastery of the Bible in the mother-tongue of the student—this alone would have occasioned little perplexity. But when there is coupled with this an equally insistent determination to bring to the student the essential disciplines of a standard Theological and Religious Education curriculum the difficulties of selection and of adequacy of treatment become evident. The element of time is a decisive factor. The number of hours of required and elective work which a student can efficiently carry is limited. Courses of study cannot be multiplied indefinitely. And so the dilemma involves the danger either of the omission of subjects which ought to be included, or of haste and superficiality in their treatment.

If the quality is not there, no matter how good the underlying idea may be, ultimate failure is inevitable.

And nowhere is this more true than in the sphere of education. An education which is on the one hand partial, or on the other hand superficial, must eventually prove a handicap instead of an equipment.

This, then, is the problem which confronted The Biblical Seminary—the problem of developing a “Bibliocracy, which shall know its Bible better than any other book,” and at the same time of giving an education exemplifying the highest scholarship in those subjects which are recognized to be vital to the theological curriculum.

This problem has been successfully solved. This Bible-centered, theologically adequate curriculum has been successfully constructed. And, lest this statement should seem to be a mere assertion, let me hasten to substantiate it with proof.

First. The Biblical Seminary is chartered by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, and registered as an institution of the first rank, with the right to recommend its students both for the theological degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor of Sacred Theology, and also for the religious education degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor of Religious Education—the highest degrees ever granted within these respective fields.¹

Its curriculum has thus received the most authoritative recognition possible in the State of New York. And if its curriculum, this Bible-centered curriculum, had been either inadequate or superficial, it is certain that such distinguished and official endorsement would have been unthinkable.

Second. Moreover, if further testimony to the thor-

¹ This was written before the Board of Regents, on May 15, 1930, granted to The Biblical Seminary an absolute charter, with power to confer degrees in Theology and Religious Education.

oughness and scholarly quality of its work were needed, it would be supplied by the added fact, that, pursuant upon a plan of co-operation consummated by The Biblical Seminary and New York University, courses from the regular curriculum of the Seminary—this Bible-centered curriculum—are accepted by the School of Education of the University with full credit towards the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy.

Thus, not alone in the specifically religious field, under its two aspects of Theology and Religious Education, but also in the more strictly academic field of education in general, the curriculum as a whole, and the several courses in particular, have received unimpeachable attestation.

THE METHOD OF SOLUTION

In view of this, it is interesting to ask how the solution of this at first sight insoluble problem has been reached. By what process has it been made possible to set aside so many hours to the courses in the English Bible—fully one-third of the total hours necessary to graduation—and still to meet such exacting requirements in regard to the curriculum as a whole?

The answer in a single phrase might be, by a process of unification of the curriculum. Not a unification which has been fabricated out of educational short-cuts or novelties, but one which has resulted from a persistent and practical application of what is, after all, a very simple, non-spectacular idea, namely, a recognition of the possibility of utilizing by-products from one course for the furtherance of the work of other courses, and thus turning to advantage the kinship existing between subjects which are sometimes taught as though they were wholly unrelated. In The Biblical Seminary there

are no artificial barriers separating the departments or the courses.

Exegesis.—As an instance, take the department of Exegesis. Why should the term, exegesis, that is, the drawing forth from language of the meaning which its phraseology was intended to convey—why should this term, exegesis, be limited in its Scriptural application to the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New? To be sure, the original tongue of the Old Testament was Hebrew, and of the New Testament, Greek; and the importance of these languages and of their correct exegesis cannot be overstated. But the basic principles of scientific exegesis are the same in all languages. English exegesis has the same inherent rights and makes the same imperious demands as Greek exegesis. It is as necessary that valid exegetical principles be applied to the English translation as to the Greek and Hebrew originals. And it is impossible to attain trustworthy results in the English Bible courses without honoring the same principles which in any other language make exegetical conclusions reliable.

Therefore every course in the English Bible is in reality a positive factor in the development of scholarly attainments in the department of Exegesis. Through these courses the student is learning to be a dependable exegete, which is, after all, the ultimate goal of all exegetical studies. Exegetes, not exegesis. Or rather, exegesis in order to exegetes. The teaching of subjects in order to the development of qualified men and women. And in this sense the English Bible courses might with recognizable propriety be listed in the catalogue under Exegesis as well as under English Bible.

The Biblical Seminary, indeed, offers standard

three-year courses in both Hebrew and Greek, and its theological degrees are conditioned on the completion of the full requirements in either one or the other of these languages; but it is also evident that a very considerable by-product from the English Bible courses contributes to the exegetical proficiency attained through the work done in the original tongues.

Hermeneutics.—Moreover, is it not clear that what has been said in regard to Exegesis applies equally to the closely allied study of Hermeneutics? Hermeneutics is the science of correct interpretation. As such it involves both basic theory and competent method. But a true theory and method of interpretation is not only essential to properly conducted courses in the English Bible, but also in turn inevitably develops from them. Scientifically tested modes of approach are insisted upon in all the Bible courses of the Seminary, and this in effect transforms these studies into laboratory courses in Hermeneutics.

Manifestly, in the fields of Exegesis and Hermeneutics—two subjects indispensable to the theological curriculum—a saving of time as well as an increase in efficiency is thus effected both for students and instructors.

Historical and Critical Introduction.—This kinship between courses may also be illustrated through the relation of the classes in the English Bible to those studies in Historical and Critical Introduction which have a recognized place in the modern theological curriculum. The following quotations from the Description of Courses as given in the Seminary catalogue may be cited as typical of the quest for exact, unbiased scholarship which characterizes all the work in the Eng-

lish Bible. The following is the description of the course in the Gospel by John:

"The Gospel by John. A thorough study of the entire Gospel, with specially detailed exegesis of selected portions. The chief problems of criticism investigated. The external and internal evidences for the genuineness and authenticity of the Gospel weighed. Collateral reading representing all views required."

And here is the description of the method followed in the study of the Gospel by Luke:

"The Gospel by Luke. A mastery of the Gospel itself in harmony with the author's method and purpose as set forth in chapter 1:1-4, and an investigation of the important critical problems involved in the Lucan narrative, such as the general problems of date, authorship, and sources, and the special questions bearing upon the historicity of details. Acquaintance with the literature representing the different schools of thought required."

Now, in the construction of the curriculum, courses dealing specifically with the field of Criticism are also included in the program of each of the three years: In the first year, a course entitled Introduction to Historical and Critical Study, providing the prerequisites of successful research in a study of the principles and methods of investigation; in the second year, Historical and Critical Study of the Bible Books; and in the third year, The Bible and Modern Knowledge, a source-study, in which the latest results of research are considered. But what I am asking you to notice is that these specialized courses can count upon the work done in the English Bible as making, because of its quality and breadth, an authentic and substantial contribution in the same field. And so, once more, departmental

barriers are overleaped, time is conserved, and the interests of thoroughness in scholarship are advanced.

Biblical Theology and Homiletics.—All that I have been saying is true, perhaps especially true, with respect to the work in Biblical Theology and Homiletics. It needs no argument to prove that each of these disciplines finds an efficient ally in such a study of the English Bible as is invariably pursued in The Biblical Seminary—a study exegetically trustworthy, open-minded, constructive, and abreast of the latest findings of reverent scholarship. Such Bible study inevitably furnishes varied and essential material both for the department of Homiletics and for the department of Biblical Theology.

Competent courses are provided in the curriculum for careful training in each of these fields, but the work is at once strengthened and simplified, enriched and saved from needless repetition, through a recognition of the comradeship of the courses in the English Bible.

A FINAL ILLUSTRATION

As a final illustration of this endeavor to unify the curriculum, I suggest an instance which is of an entirely different sort from those I have been adducing.

In a book entitled *The Teaching Work of the Church*, issued through the Association Press by the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, we find this summarizing sentence, made emphatic through italics:

“What is needed is a new orientation of the entire course: the teaching of the old subjects, exegesis, history, theology, and the like, in the light of the new tasks and problems the student is going out to face.”

“A new orientation,” “the old subjects” taught “in

the light of the new tasks and problems"—this is precisely what The Biblical Seminary is seeking to do, and in so doing both simplifying and enriching its curriculum.

Systematic Theology.—An outstanding example is the course in theology. Is there such a possibility as a new orientation in the study of Systematic Theology? What new approach can be adopted, fundamental in its own right, which yet recognizes the problems of this doctrinally restless, resentful age? What constructive contribution can here be made? The answer of our curriculum is as follows:

Instead of the traditional and formal method of approaching Systematic Theology, The Biblical Seminary develops its course under a threefold relation—that of history, of psychology, and of philosophy. That is, in each of the three years the cardinal doctrines of Systematic Theology are studied, but with a varying method of approach—the historical, the psychological, and the philosophical methods.

Contributing to a symposium on the subject, Adequate Theological Training, one of the distinguished men in the field of modern education, Dr. Shailer Matthews, makes his first point as follows: "No man can preach wisely today who is not historically-minded. Our churches are suffering from preachers who know nothing of the history of the religion they represent . . . the student should be able to understand how and why doctrines emerged, how institutions and customs developed, why there was need of reformation, why there have always been change and development in Christendom."

It is this angle of approach to the Systematic study

of Theology which is frankly, without fear, and without bias or dogmatic prejudice, adopted in the first year course in our Seminary. We recognize the truth of Gwatkin's impressive sentence in his Preface of Sohm's *Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss*: "Not by unreasoning worship of the past, nor by ignorant contempt of it, nor yet by partisan distortion of it, but by critical and sympathetic study of it, we shall learn something of the grandeur of our own time, and of the meaning of the mighty questions which lie before our children." We believe in Schiller's "Weltgeschichte ist weltgerichte," and in Emerson's famous aphorism: "The lesson of life is to believe what the years and the centuries say as against the hours." And we rejoice in the exalted implications of Lowell's lines:

Nor is he far astray who deems
That every thought that rises and grows broad
In the world's heart, by ordered impulse streams
From the great heart of God.

By the aid of this historical method our students are asked during their first year to think their own way through the doctrines of our faith.

This same article by Shailer Matthews in the symposium above referred to very properly makes the point: "There are a great many things that a theological seminary does not need to teach. It ought to assume that its students know them when they come from college." Very true. And yet, when the writer names psychology as one of those subjects, one hesitates. Elementary psychology? Yes. And this is probably that to which reference is made. But suppose that within the bounds of this new science of psychology there is a proper field of investigation which might be classified as the 'Psychology of the Christian Faith'—the caption of our

course in theology for the second year—then psychology becomes one of our most valuable, not to say essential, instructors in theology. And in view of the already precocious development of this infant science and the lusty, though perhaps sometimes confusing tones with which it is making its presence known, one might almost be justified in altering the phraseology of the sentence just quoted, and saying: 'No man can preach wisely today who is not psychologically-minded. Our churches are suffering from preachers who know nothing of the psychology of the religion they represent.'

This is the second mode of approach to the doctrines of our faith through which our curriculum develops its study of theology.

And these two are completed and crowned in the third year by a philosophical approach. History, Psychology, Philosophy—experience, personality, the faculties of the mind. Not as though these can be too definitely distinguished from one another. The study of each must always involve the study of the other two. This course is closely integrated, progressive, cumulative. And all three together focus the treasures of experience, the sanctities of personality, and the sublime possibilities of thought upon those age-long, unchanging truths concerning which "of old time God spake unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners," and which in the end of these days He has brought into divine fulness of revelation "in his Son."

By this threefold method of approach the course of Theology in one sense draws to itself courses from Church History and Religious Education, and in another sense it itself becomes the ally of the studies in those fields.

THE RESULT

The practical outworking of all this is a curriculum which is a unit of instruction instead of an agglomeration of more or less distinct departments, a course of study rather than a group of rigidly differentiated courses of study. By-products have been utilized. Similarities of subject matter, which are only too apt to develop fruitless, energy-wasting duplications, have been capitalized. Interrelations between courses have been transformed into instrumentalities which make for time saving and efficiency.

Thus, instead of incompleteness in this Bible-centered curriculum, no discipline essential to a properly constructed theological course need fail to receive its emphasis, and instead of superficiality, such varied attainments in scholarship are involved as make understandable the high academic recognition which the Seminary has received.

I began by saying that the problem of the construction of a Bible-centered, theologically adequate curriculum has been successfully solved; may I close by changing the tense of the verb? "Has been successfully solved" sounds so smug and self-satisfied. It seems to image a finality, an ultimate completeness, the sort of solution with respect to which it only remains in capitals and periods to write *quod erat demonstrandum*. Nothing could be further from the truth. The pioneering idea, which is the very life of The Biblical Seminary, is continuously forward-looking, continuously germinal, never sterile, never static, never unprogressive.

I have recently been re-reading Emerson's *Essays*. This sentence from the opening paragraph of the essay entitled *Circles*, voicing the informing idea of the whole

essay, suggests the vision of our Seminary which this Founders' Day must bring us:

"Every action admits of being outdone. Our life is an apprenticeship to the truth that around every circle another can be drawn; that there is no end in nature, but every end is a beginning; that there is always another dawn risen on mid-noon, and under every deep a lower deep opens."

The problem of our Bible-centered curriculum has been solved? Yes, in the sense and to the degree which I have pointed out. With adoring gratitude we offer our sacrifice of thanksgiving to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, throughout all the years that are passed, hath led us, and taught us, and saved us from our mistakes, and shown Himself strong in our behalf. The position of respect and honor which we today hold in the educational world is His doing, and truly it is marvelous in our eyes.

And yet, is it not true that "around every circle another can be drawn," and "every end is a beginning"? And even as with a humble confidence we say the problem has been solved, we gladly hasten to add, Nay, not as though we had already attained. The problem is still being solved. The solution already achieved beckons towards a still more perfect solution yet to be discovered and worked out. Another dawn of possibility and progress is even now rising on our mid-noon; another depth of understanding of both our opportunity and our obligation will ever open beneath the deep which we had already discerned.

EXEGETICAL

THE LABORS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

By HOWARD T. KUIST, Ph.D.

IT HAS BEEN some time since Trench pointed out that, "It is well worth our while to note the frequent use which is made of κόπος and of the verb κοπιᾶω, for designating what are or ought to be the labors of the Christian ministry, containing as they do a word of warning (and may we not also say, encouragement) for all that are in it engaged" (*Synonyms*, p. 379). To this it may be added that the use of this word in the papyri throws fresh light on those passages in the New Testament where the arduous aspect of the Christian life is presented.

Κόπος (related to κόπτω, cut) suggested at first a striking or beating on the breast denoting sorrow; then it came to mean toil, trouble, suffering, accompanied by fatigue or weariness.

Κόπος appears in the phrase κόπους παρέχειν τινι five times in the New Testament. This phrase which appears in Greek literature from the times of Aeschelus and Sophocles seems to have had a causative sense—to make work for someone, *i.e.*, to cause him trouble. Whether the woman who anointed Jesus is troubled by the disciples (Matt. 26:10; Mark 14:6), or the father in bed with his children is awakened at midnight by the unwelcome guest (Luke 11:7), or the unrighteous judge is given no rest by the importunate widow (Luke 18:5), or the Apostle Paul is hurling defiance at his enemies

(Gal. 6:17), this word κόπος always contributes vividness to the scene which is being described. A particularly apt illustration of its use in the papyri is found in a letter exchanged between two officials in the year 115 B.C. (*Papyrus Tebtunis* I.2), the editor's translation of which reads:

Polemon to Polemon. Greeting. I have written to Artemidorus the collector to stop work at Kerkeosiris until he proceeds to the city, and that Aristippus will come to an understanding with him. Do not therefore run away from anybody, for at present you have no produce. *If he gives you trouble* go up with him. . . .

Still another from the second century A.D. (*Berlin: Griechische Urkunden* 815, Fayûm) has this:

Above all things we pray that you may be well. I wish you to know I received your letter. If you see that Socrates the Procurator *makes any trouble* concerning the feast let me know. . . .

Professor Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 262 f.) has shown how the renowned magical *Papyrus Anastasy* 65, in the words, "If anyone troubles me," throws light on the meaning of Galatians 6:17.

Lightfoot found the notion of toilsome training for an athletic contest in this word (*Commentary—Ignatius ad Polycarp* VI). The derived meaning of κόπος, toil, work accompanied by fatigue, appears most clearly when Paul refers to the laborious character of his own itinerant ministry in the Mediterranean world. He urged the Philippians to live blameless lives as a witness to the effectiveness of his toilsome labors (Phil. 2:16); he considered that his arduous experiences were but an opportunity to commend him as a minister of God (2 Cor. 6:5; Col. 1:29; Acts 20:35). At times he feared lest his ministry conducted at such personal cost had been without commensurate result (Gal. 4:11; 1 Thess.

3:5); yet he encouraged others to be steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as they knew that their wearisome toil (κόπος) in the Lord was never spent in vain (1 Cor. 15:58). Because he had set his hope on the living God he expected to achieve the goal of his toilsome strivings (1 Tim. 4:10). And as the Christians of the early church read his Epistles they understood what Paul meant by κόπος, for they themselves used this word in their vernacular to describe how the wear and tear of life affected them. We are given a first-hand picture of the meaning of this word in the early Christian centuries in the letter of one Morus to a friend Epimachus (*Papyrus Oxyrynchus* 1482, 6, 120-160 A.D.)

Morus to my Lord Epimachus. Greeting. I wrote to inform you that we have winnowed the barley of the man from the Oasis on the 8th and *we never had so much trouble* in winnowing it; for it rained and the wind was irresistible and Parcus knows how we worked to succeed in transferring all the rest with the help of the gods.

Anyone who has toiled under difficulties senses at once the force of κόπος as Morus used it. So one enters also into sympathetic understanding with the boy Eutychides who was left at home on the farm during his father's absence, and who wrote to him about his difficulties with the hired hands (*Papyrus Amherst* II. 133, 11, early second century). "With many troubles [κόπων] I made them set to work," says he. Whether it is the resistance of the elements, as in the case of Morus, or of human nature, as in that of Eutychides, both alike make life arduous. They involve toil and trouble, and the consequent triumph or defeat of the human spirit issues in a corresponding joyful radiance or discouragement, as the case may be.

In the words of Paul, "I labored more abundantly

than they all," as applied to missionary work, Deissmann finds the joyful pride of the skilful weaver who, working by the piece, was able to hand in the largest amount of stuff on pay day. (*Light from the Ancient East*, p. 313. See also 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 11:23.) And on the other hand, in the frequent references to "labor in vain," he finds a trembling echo of the discouragement resulting from a width of cloth being rejected as badly woven and therefore not paid for.

When Jesus emphasized the character of the activity to which He was summoning His disciples He gave them to understand that their lot was not to be an easy one. Upon one occasion, after He had been "oppressed by fatigue" (κεκοπιακώς, perfect tense—John 4:6), He said, "I sent you to reap a crop for which you did not toil; other men have toiled, and you reap the profit of their toil" (Moffatt: John 4:38). The fact that they shared in the visible results of others' labors (κεκοπιάκασιν, perfect tense), was to be an incentive for their labors also. "Lift up *your* eyes, and look on the fields that they are white already unto the harvest." Their meat was also to do the will of another and accomplish his work (ἔργον).

This association of κόπος with ἔργον is also found in other suggestive passages which amply repay study (1 Cor. 15:58; Eph. 4:28; Rev. 2:2-3; 14:13). "We *toil, working* with our own hands" (κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι), cries the Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 4:12). And the Seer of Patmos exclaims: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest *from their wearinesses* [κόπων]; for their works [ἔργα] do follow them" (Rev. 14:13). As distinguished from the general term for work (ἔργον), κόπος expresses the cost associated with it, as well as its issue.

(Cf. Milligan: *Commentary on Thessalonians*, p. 7.) What an exalted meaning Paul gives to the arduous experiences of the Thessalonian Christians when, in addressing them in the First Epistle (1 Thess. 1:3), he reminds them of their "work of faith" (τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως) and "labor of love" (τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης). When motivated by love κόπος becomes transfigured. It becomes the laborious toil from which love in its zeal for others does not shrink. Faith leads to activity in Christ's Name, but love pays the cost. Mary who toiled much for the Roman church (πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν—Rom. 16:6), Tryphaena and Tryphosa who "toiled hard in the Lord," the beloved Persis who "toiled very hard in the Lord," are typical examples of such love, which voluntarily assumes and endures troubles and pains for others.

What memories led Flabia Gemella to erect a tombstone in the Roman Cemetery of S. Pontiani (Via Portuensi) to honor her husband Epipodios, "who," says she, "*toiled much for me*" (*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* 9552. See also Deissmann: *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 313). And what years of honest toil inspired the euology to Daphnus the gardner, who passed to his reward "*after he had toiled very hard.*"

But the crowning use of this word in the New Testament comes from the lips of our Lord who, at the close of His stern, yet equally tender, discourse in the presence of the bewildered and burdened multitudes (Matt. 11:28), says in effect: 'Come unto Me all ye who are being wearied [οἱ κοπιῶντες, present tense] and are burdened under life's load [πεφορτισμένοι, perfect tense]—come unto Me and I will refresh you. Take me as your yoke-fellow . . . for mine is a kindly yoke [χρηστός; cf. 1 Cor. 13:4; Eph. 4:32], and a load with my aid is light.'

SECOND CORINTHIANS 3:12-4:6

By ANDREW R. OSBORN

TO APPRECIATE the intensity of confident joy in this great utterance of the Apostle we must know something of the great longing for salvation in the hearts of the men of the first century, what Kattenbusch calls "the wonderfully deep longing of that time for a salvation, a saving, rescuing God, for a σωτηρία, α σωτήρ" (*Real-Encyclopaedia* XVII, p. 351, 3rd ed.). It sprang from the vivid realization of the weary and heavy weight of the unintelligible world. Such a weight seems to lie upon our hearts today, and therefore the words of Paul have a special interest for us.

Throughout the passage the Apostle, with true Oriental mind, is thinking in pictures, and these pictures center around the thought of the glory and the veil. The use of the word δόξα as the equivalent of the Hebrew *kabodh* is one of the most interesting lexical studies in the Bible. Its primary meaning is that of visible splendor (*e.g.*, Acts 22:11). It has however the special meaning of the splendor which radiates from the presence of God (Ex. 24:16, 1 Kings 8:11). From this special meaning it comes naturally to signify the splendor of the divine perfections as manifested in God's works. In verse 6 of chapter 4 Paul links the idea of the glory of God in His creative work to the glory of His redeeming work. Genesis 1:2 tells how the primeval earth was chaotic and darkness lay heavy upon it. Then God by His creative word, "Let there be light," scattered the darkness, and out of chaos brought the ordered world.

This darkness was a symbol in the Apostle's mind of the spiritual night of the human race. The human spirit was in bondage. It felt a powerful longing to be free, but all its strivings resulted in a chaos of human hopes and fears. In his own experience Paul had known the meaning of this, as he struggled vainly to find salvation through the Law. Then the divine glory was manifested again. At the creation it showed itself in creative power; now it appeared in redeeming glory. It was the knowledge of this redeeming work of God, which had changed Paul's life, even as the beams of new created light had scattered the darkness of primeval chaos.

But this new redeeming light, this knowledge of the divine power active in human history was not known by any power of logic or intuition. It came to Paul, when he saw it in the face or person of Jesus Christ. In other words Jesus is the manifestation of divine redeeming power in human form; in His face or person we behold the glory of God.

The knowledge of the glory of the redeeming work of God filled the heart of the Apostle with hope and joy; therefore he proclaimed the Gospel with boldness, for the same glory was in him that was in Jesus. In verse 18 of chapter 3 he tells how the Christian beholds the glory of the Lord with unveiled face. The reference to the veil is derived from the story of Moses in Exodus 34:29-35. Not only was the glory of God specially revealed at the creation and in the coming of Jesus, but it was also manifested on Mt. Sinai at the giving of the Law. Moses at this time went into the presence of Jehovah, and on his return to the people his face reflected the divine glory. This made Aaron and the

people afraid, and Moses therefore put a veil on his face. Verses 34 and 35 state that Moses took the veil off when he went into the presence of Jehovah. Then he came out, and with face still unveiled spoke the words of the Commandments to the people. Then he put the veil on once more.

Paul, with his rabbinic training, sees in this an allegory. The true way to know the divine command is to behold the divine glory with unveiled face. This the Israelites did not want to do, and therefore Moses veiled his face; but he did so after delivering the divine message, and when the glory was fading. This fact leads to two thoughts: First, that the glory of the Law was transient; second, that a veil, that of formalism, hid from the Jews the divine redeeming power which had given the Law. So they kept to the dead letter, and did not realize the living spirit. Paul had done the same thing, and he had found that instead of freedom the Law had brought bondage. So with the thought of the veil he joined that of bondage. But the true believer beholds the glory of the Lord without the obscuring veil.

When Paul speaks in verse 18 of the glory of the Lord, does he mean the glory of God or of Jesus? Either interpretation may be given, for the glory of God is seen in the face of Jesus Christ. The essential thing is that we behold with unveiled face, for, just as a veil was over the Law, so unbelief and love of the world will veil the glorious Gospel of Christ. Those, on the other hand, who behold with unveiled face, are changed, until in their lives there is a power, a glory, like to that of Christ. Chrysostom in commenting on this says that the Christian reflects the divine character,

just as polished silver reflects the rays of the sun. The participle *κατοπτριζόμενοι* can mean this, or it may simply mean beholding in Jesus the divine glory as in a mirror. In either case the Christian knows as a glorious experience the redeeming power of God in Christ; he has the secret of salvation. Therefore he speaks with boldness the message of salvation.

NEW YORK.

THE REVIEW

TRENDS IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

THE MOST SIGNIFICANT trend in recent religious thought is the slow, but apparently steady, recoil from the radicalism of the last decade. We are emerging from an era of iconoclasm, in which old beliefs and institutions were ruthlessly scrapped. Doubtless there is a sort of berserk rapture in casting out what are supposed to be relics of the barbaric past; but, when the room has been swept of its antiques and dust, it has a strangely empty look about it. When the iconoclast realizes this he begins to wonder if he has gone too far. This is the mood which seems to be coming over a great many critics, and it is a hopeful sign.

In *Books Abroad*, an excellent quarterly issued by the University of Oklahoma Press, there is an interesting article by Henrietta von Klenze on A New Spirit in German Literature, which illustrates this trend. The new spirit is religious. The writer says: "The birth pangs of a new spirit are manifesting themselves unmistakably in the works that are dropping from the German presses. A religious spirit, but in a totally new sense. 'Cosmic religion' some one has called it. A combination of ultra-naturalism—that shrinks from no utter depths of degradation—and the unbroken consciousness of the innately divine in man—perhaps not in every man, but in some apparently hopeless specimens."

This reference to cosmic religion seems to warrant a digression to an article by Professor Albert Einstein in the magazine section of *The New York Times*. Einstein thinks that among primitive peoples religion springs from some form of fear. As man develops a second source of religious development is found in the social feelings. He longs for guidance from a God of providence, who cares for him as a human parent would. This

is the social or moral idea of God. Judaism and Christianity have it. It is not however the highest stage, for exceptionally gifted individuals rise above it. "In these there is found a third level of religious experience, even if it is seldom found in a pure form. I will call it the cosmic religious sense." In this higher level there is no anthropomorphic idea of God; ". . . the individual feels the vanity of human desires and aims, and the nobility and marvelous order which are revealed in nature and the world of thought. He feels the individual destiny as an imprisonment and seeks to experience the totality of existence as a unity full of significance. . . . The religious geniuses of all times have been distinguished by this cosmic religious sense, which recognises neither dogmas nor God made in man's image."

It seems not at all unlikely that, with such distinguished sponsorship, cosmic religion will become the successor of humanism, which has already had its day. But what is this cosmic religion, which Einstein has embraced and which is pervading German literature? Like humanism, it is difficult to define, and apparently it has different meanings with different people. What Einstein describes bears a most striking resemblance to the pantheism of the nineteenth century, which owed much of both its form and spirit to Spinoza. In his own day Spinoza was regarded as an atheist; to Novalis and the Romanticists of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century he was "a God-intoxicated man." There was much of Spinoza's influence in the nature philosophy of Schelling. From Germany the line of thought passed over to the transcendentalism of New England. There is a revival of transcendentalism today in the nature philosophy of scientists with views similar to those of Sir Arthur Eddington. Perhaps the best term to describe this tendency in religious scientific thought is nature mysticism. Einstein is a nature mystic, and his thought is essentially that of Wordsworth in the lines:

"And I have felt

A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime

Of something far more deeply interfused,
 Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
 And the round ocean, and the living air,
 And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
 A motion and a spirit, that impels
 All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
 And rolls through all things."

—Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey.

Incidentally this type of pantheism is not necessarily impersonal. Tennyson, in his *Higher Pantheism*, wrote:

"Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet—

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

Einstein's affirmation of order revealed in nature and in the world of thought is at least compatible with personality, and the distinguished scientist erred when he spoke of God being made in the image of man; if he will look at the Hebrew Scriptures, he will find it written that man was made in the image of God—there is a difference.

But what of the cosmic religion in German literature? This is apparently of another order. Dr. von Klenze illustrates it from a recent work of fiction called *The History of Franz Biberkopf*. Franz is a low character who has just come out of prison for killing his lover accidentally in a fit of jealousy. In prison a change has come upon him; he experiences cosmic religion. "No outer force works upon him. It is the spirit of this new religious movement to be totally free not only from all dogmatism, but from all traditional forms of conversion or conviction of sin. It is life working upon the spirit of man—a realization of the individual's responsibility to his own inner consciousness of life and its meaning." So Biberkopf wins a victory. He leaves the prison a changed man, gives up his old life, and seeks a job so as to earn an honest living. There does not seem to be much in common between this cosmic religion and that of Einstein's, and yet there is a linkage. The mind of man cannot rest in the contemplation of a dead universe, nor will it wallow endlessly in the filth of stark

realism. The reason was stated long ago by Augustine when he affirmed, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless, until they find rest in Thee."

There should be much comfort for the conservative theologian in these trends of thought, however vague and unsatisfactory they may at first appear. They show that there is a revolt from atheism and sensualism, if not a returning tide of faith. What is needed now is a campaign of educational evangelism, which will show that the great cry of the human heart can be answered truly only by the old Gospel message. Nor need we be troubled about the outcry against dogma. Our real problem is that we have lost vital religion. Let us not forget that good theology is always based upon living faith. Where there is such faith it must state the grounds upon which it rests, and in so doing it formulates dogmas in the right sense of that term. The immediate problem facing the church then is the rediscovery of real religion.

Among recent books there is one on *Religion in a Changing World* by Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver (Richard R. Smith, Inc.). Dr. Silver is a leader in liberal Judaism. Obviously his statement will differ in many ways from that of Christianity, but there is a vigor, and even a prophetic touch about his work, that is stimulating. He begins with a challenging statement: "Much of our religious thinking in recent years has been characterized by nervousness and timidity" (p. 1). This is true; there has been too much apologizing and too little apologetic. Or again: "Religion is not a demulcent theosophy, an escape from reality. It is the indefeasible optimism of the race which sustains itself on the conviction that the universe of which man is a part, is the dwelling place of life not of death, of reason not of insensibility, of goodness not of evil. 'The Lord is with me, I need not fear.' Religion is at heart messianic. It alone can proclaim in our day the dogma of human progress and the value of human ideals." (P. 16.)

Rabbi Silver takes a firm stand also on the relation of religion to ethics. The reason why our moral standards are failing is not because the old morality has been found wanting,

"but because of a general weakening of moral fibres caused by increased wealth and ease and luxury and self-pampering and by the wild tempo of a furiously acquisitive civilization. Homes are disintegrating. The purity of family life is disappearing. Men and women are demanding the right of self-expression, though most of them have nothing to express but the most common-place hankerings after the most primitive satisfactions. Religion is asked to sanction this neo-paganism, to give its approval to all new experiments in marriage and divorce, to companionate marriage, to trial marriage, and to all forms of experimental sex promiscuity. And all in the name of the Great God Change. But religion had met these aberrations before and had waged relentless war upon them. It refused to be changed by them. It set about changing them. It must do so again." (P. 21.)

What we like about a statement of this kind is that it shows a man of convictions, who is prepared to maintain them. So has it always been with true religious leaders, and so must it be in the field of living Christian faith, if that faith is to be maintained.

Another recent book showing the trend of thought is William Adams Brown's *Pathways to Certainty* (Scribner's). We need certainty in religion. Humanism does not afford it, and cosmic religion will not. What the world needs is just that certainty which characterized old time religion. Dr. Brown knows that, and he wants to help those who have lost their certainty to regain it. He has some fine things to say. He is undoubtedly right when he maintains that religion must not be in bondage to the methods by which science has won its successes (p. 21). He is also right when he shows the seriousness for society of loss of belief in God. "In losing God men are losing more than a particular belief. They are losing the standpoints that until yesterday gave definiteness to their views on art and politics, on education and on morals. Where this loss occurs fellowship in any large sense becomes increasingly difficult, for men have no longer anything worth while to share." (P. 31.) Still further, we shall not find our way back to faith

without soul struggle. "We want our certainty as the commuter wants his breakfast—ready at our call. If we cannot get it in that way, we are tempted to give it up altogether." (P. 42.)

Dr. Brown examines for the benefit of the seeker various ways along which men do find certainty. There is the way of authority, the way of intuition, the way of reasoning, the way of experiment. What he has to say about each of these ways contains many helpful and suggestive thoughts, and yet it is doubtful if the author has realized his aims. There are two criticisms we would pass upon the book. The first is that the treatment of the great themes dealt with is too superficial. Doubtless this is due in large measure to the fact that the book is intended to have a popular appeal; but popular presentation is not inconsistent with adequate treatment. Take, for example, the chapter on Intuition. Here is a subject on which a clear statement by a man of authority would be of great value. The range of inquiry involved is vast. There is intuition in science, literature, art, religion. Wordsworth in his *Peel Castle in a Storm* speaks of the "light that never was on sea or land." In his *Lines Composed a Few Miles above Tintern Abbey* he gives a description of the psychology of inspiration that Dr. Brown might well have quoted, concluding with the words:

"Until, the breath of this corporeal frame,
And even the motion of our human blood
Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
In body, and become a living soul:
While with an eye made quiet by the power
Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
We see into the life of things."

In his *Prelude* Wordsworth affirms that Coleridge and he were prophets even as were the writers of the Old Testament. The discussion of these questions interests the man in the street just as it does the student in the classroom. What again is the relation, if any, of intuition, as a scientist such as Poincaré states it or as the poet defines it, with Karl Barth's appeal to

the voice of conscience? We are disappointed when we come to Dr. Brown's book for an answer to these questions, and we wish he had dug deeper.

Our second criticism is his treatment of the person of Christ. Jesus, he says, is a Teacher and a Symbol. He shows the kind of life men ought to live; He shows the kind of spirit that must prevail, if this life is ever to be realized. "Once more Jesus symbolizes to His disciples the resources on which we must rely if the obstacles which now impede the life of love in us and in others are ever to be overcome. Jesus' life was flooded by the inrush of a divine love which made him conscious of fellowship with one who was able to supply his every need. So he has become to his followers the symbol of what God is like and the channel whereby the love of God may find access to the spirits of men." (P. 115.)

This statement carries no conviction. What this world needs is a Redeemer. The firm assurance that in Jesus the redeeming power of God was manifest, that Jesus was alive and regnant, and that God through Christ was overcoming the sin of the world—this was the message that sent the early Christians to proclaim with enthusiasm and abiding hope the message of the cross. Is there any message which can take its place today? After all, is it not a fact that ultimately the problem of certainty is bound up with the question of what we think of Jesus? Those, and those alone, who see in Him the fulfillment of divine purpose throughout the ages for the redemption of mankind, who behold in His face the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, have the certainty of Christian faith.

We could wish that Professor Brown had included somewhere in his work a Christian philosophy of history with a statement in modern language of the meaning of the divine decrees. We are old-fashioned enough to think that before long men will be discussing these questions again, and that, until they do, there will be small increase in certainty and little revival in religion.

ANDREW R. OSBORN.

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THE SHORT PARAGRAPHS, WITHOUT COMMENT, IMMEDIATELY following were taken just as they happened to be found in the literature of recent months; that is, they were not chosen with a view to any particular subject or purpose. But the increasing concern over religious matters is strongly reflected in them as a whole:

"The gospel is the answer to the question, 'What's the cause?'"—*The Christian Advocate*.

"The cure of racketeering and gangster rule is a citizenship which has recovered God."—*The United Presbyterian*.

"The home land is every land where Christ is; the foreign land only that which has rejected him."—*Dr. John R. Mott*.

"When a genuine religious movement gets afoot two things usually happen. Some people are converted and others are offended."—*Rev. Samuel M. Shoemaker*.

"But the negation of immortality is an abandonment of all ideas, a paralysis of all thought, imagination, conception, and speech."—*Dr. Abraham Cronbach in Greatest Thoughts on Immortality*.

"The amateur does not do things so well technically as the professional, but from his irresponsible and joyous doing of them arises a unique set of values."—*Daniel Gregory Mason in Harper's Monthly Magazine*.

"The weakness and ineffectiveness of modern preaching may result partly from the failure of the preacher to claim from us all that he should claim. Christianity, faithfully presented, is a creed for heroes."—*Dean Inge in Christian Ethics and Modern Problems*.

"It would be an immense gain if some of the pastors became sure of anything. It is time that the strength of the ministry is changed from intellectual exercises to an eager evangelism."—*Dr. Charles L. Goodell in an address at Drew Theological Seminary*.

"Science has made numerous contributions to the ways and means of modern life, and has opened up vast reaches of the universe, but it can have nothing to say about the purpose of it all, nor the values which constantly confront a man all along the way."—*Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr*.

"We believe too much emphasis can be given to 'good works' and too little to the value of prayer, meditation and praise, but activity of some sort is so obviously expected of a Christian that we wonder how any true believer can quell the impulse to further the Gospel."—*The Lutheran*.

SIMPLY TO UTTER THE TRUTH IS NOT ENOUGH. IF PREACHING IS to accomplish its aim it must deliver its message in a manner to arrest attention and bring conviction. We all hear sermons to which no one could take exception so far as theological correctness goes, yet no one seems moved by them. May it not be that the preacher is more concerned with his sermon than with his audience? It is a principle in the advertising business that a manufacturer should never attempt to write his own advertisements, since he is so much more interested in the thing about which he writes than in the people to whom he appeals. In other words, one must know human nature in order to secure its response.

There is, however, no cold, scientific formula for attracting men and moving them to any desired action. This is an art in itself, and to this extent your successful preacher of the Gospel must be an artist. He must, that is, have an audience sense, an intuitive understanding of people's mental attitudes and interests and capacities so that he may speak sympathetically, to use this adverb in its broad sense. The whole bearing and utterance of some men in the pulpit seem to put a great distance between themselves and the people in the pews, while others give the impression of being right among them, talking of vital things in a friendly and intimate yet compelling way.

In order to do the most effective preaching, just what method is one to follow? There is of course no fixed rule; one's own nature and capacities are important factors. Still there

are certain principles which, clearly grasped, may greatly help, and with this in mind we commend these extracts from a paper by V. T. Mooney, pastor of Chalmers Church, Woodstock, Ontario, published in *The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*:

"Art is an arrangement of material with a view to securing an effect; science is an arrangement of material with a view to the understanding of it. Science ministers to the understanding of truth, of what it is composed, how its elements are related, how they have become what they are. Art seeks the significance of truth in relation to life, and ministers to the appreciation of it. It is the business of the artist, not only to set forth his object, but to set it forth in such form as to make it impressive."

"In religion we are dealing with life in its relations with God, exploring its deepest significance, seeking its highest values, testing our apprehensions in the crucible of life situations. Had the knowledge of God come at the end of a syllogism, or at the conclusion of a scientific experiment or of a piece of psychological analysis, it would have been best embodied, doubtless, in a great treatise on theism, which it would be the preacher's duty critically to expound. But the revelations of religion have come otherwise—through the seer's vision, his sense of fellowship with the Unseen, his convictions of moral and spiritual truth. Even when we speak of the life of Jesus Christ as the greatest revelation, what is it but a great drama enacted of God, from the prologue of Bethlehem to the final act of crucifixion and resurrection, a great drama to convey the meaning of life in God's universe as no theistic treatise could have done? Now the difficulty with spiritual experience is to give it expression. If the seer was to convey to his fellow men anything of what he had apprehended of the spiritual realm, he had to devise some means of so suggesting it to them that they would be led to see what he had seen, share the convictions he had felt, and taste the enriched life as he had experienced it. Naturally, inevitably, the expressive forms to which he turned were those of art; imagery, metaphor, analogy, legend, poetry, parable, drama, ritual, and history, pruned and adapted to fit into a dramatic framework. They are all in our Bible, necessarily there, as the only available vehicles of revelation. But, be it remembered, they make it a book to be used and interpreted as is a work of art."

"Is it not a pity that the form in which the Bible comes ordinarily into people's hands, and in which it is usually read, is that of a reference book? The artificial chapter and verse divisions spoil much of the meaning and charm of extended sections, and even books, which should be read as a whole. Indeed, the very form in which the Bible is put into people's hands invites the culling and associating of isolated sentences, or parts of sentences, for the construction of private doctrines. It has invited, too, the pernicious habit in the preacher of rising in the midst of a service of worship to quote a text, as one might enunciate a proposition of geometry, from which he proceeds by process of deduction to the demonstration of further truths—the whole being deemed a sermon. Granting that such use of certain pregnant verses may be appropriate, is not the custom of preaching from texts usually more detrimental than beneficial? With the Scriptures, as with poetry, the moment one concentrates upon an isolated sentence, his imagination is very apt to lead him far astray from that which was of chief interest to the writer. There is, of course, a place for that critical, microscopic study, which ensures one's missing no significant feature of a work; but, having done that, ought not the preacher to deal with some great religious concept or experience, seldom comprehended in any verse, but running through a whole section, or book, or even several books? Ought he not to stand in spirit before the seer's full expression of religious experience, as one might stand before a masterpiece of art, interpreting, getting the feel of it, brooding over it, until, at length, the message, which words at best can only suggest to a kindred spirit, takes possession of his soul? Then he has a message to preach. The use of the Bible thus, as a treasury of spiritual vision, makes preparation for preaching no dull conning of anciently prescribed laws and beliefs, nor a picking of one's weary way through much that has been discredited to find what truth remains, but a companying with the seers of God, an entering into their fellowship, a sharing of something of their experience, until, catching the glow of it, one is eager to share it all with the brethren of his congregation."

ONE OF THE MAIN QUESTIONS DISCUSSED BY MINISTERS AND OTHER church leaders today is that of getting people to join the church. But the question really should be, What kind of church are people being urged to join? What is the church offering

that the world does not offer? Entertainment, music, social life, informing addresses, even high standards of ethics, are all being supplied from worldly sources. What else, then, has the church? Moreover, what is there about the average church member's life and conversation to lead an outsider to feel that he is missing something essential to his peace and comfort and hope?

From the beginning it has been the very difference between the truly Christian group and the world that made this and that denomination grow in power and influence and also in numbers. The great evangelical bodies we have today did not begin or prosper by furnishing finer pulpit lectures or more enjoyable music or better entertainments or more delightful social life or a higher educational program than could be found elsewhere. They must have had—they did have—something that the world could not give, but which could satisfy the hungry and weary heart that had tried the world and found it wanting.

It would be well if all our pastors occasionally read such an article as that by Dr. H. H. Marlin, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, upon The Greatest Business in the World, the Blessed Ministry of the Gospel, but here, at any rate, are several excerpts:

"We should be more concerned about getting *saved people* into our churches and less concerned about adding to our *church membership*. When we add *names* to our church roll we ought to be *adding souls* to the kingdom of God. It is quite evident to the most casual observer that many of the names we write in our church books are never written in the Lamb's book of life. Their connection with the church is of the vaguest, most tenuous character, and they are strangers to Christ."

"The *church door* and the *strait gate* are two entirely different things. They ought to be the same but in practice they become more and more unlike. We have changed the strait gate of Christ into a church door wide as the gate of the world and we have changed the narrow path of righteousness into the broad way of every sin and folly. How can we any longer distinguish between a church member and a worldling? We cannot any longer distinguish between them. Ordinarily they are as much alike as two peas. They seek the same things;

they go to the same places; their speech is the same kind of speech; they walk together on the same level and share the same kind of companionship; they are of the earth earthy."

"In this great business in the world any man will toil in vain unless in his heart burns the promised fire. He receives power when he receives the Holy Spirit, and if he does not possess that power the hearts of men are closed to him as by walls of stone and gates of iron. The challenge at the gates of a sinner's heart must be nothing less than the challenge of God. The approach of God to the soul of a sinner is the approach of fire."

"There is very little witnessing these days on the part of church members to the redeeming grace of our Lord Jesus and thereby the church suffers very great loss. There is new power born and new joy manifested among the people who increasingly witness to the saving grace of our Lord Jesus. Every week among such a people, in such a church, some are found weeping and some are found singing at the foot of the cross of Jesus. Such a church becomes in any community a church of miracles, a church where unbelievable things happen, a place where new chapters of the Book of Acts are always being written."

IF WE ATTAIN A TRUE HARMONY BETWEEN THE CHURCHES THE matter of unity will adjust itself. One way in which harmony may be reached is to get the viewpoints of communions other than our own, not that we must of necessity adopt their understanding of things, but that we may come to appreciate why certain views are dear to them. Incidentally we will thereby not only enlarge our knowledge but broaden our Christian sympathies.

Let us, for example, look at certain interpretations of the Orthodox, or Eastern, Church, which we of the West commonly associate, not only with extreme formalism, but even with image worship. Without much spiritual responsiveness in the believer himself no form of worship can move the heart very greatly, while to the deeply spiritual the most highly liturgical service is exalting, and there seem to be many people of the latter kind in the Eastern Church. Rev. D. J. Chitty, The Egyptian Fellowship of Unity, Mena House, Cairo, published an article, The Spirit of Orthodox Christianity, in *The Christian Union*

Quarterly, and in it occur these remarks from which we may get some idea of the deep spiritual atmosphere of this branch of the church:

"Both in Russian and in Syriac, 'orthodoxy' is translated not 'right opinion' but 'right glory'—right worship. The sense given is incomplete, but significant. For it means that here the criterion is not the head but the heart. But the heart is not thought of as the seat of the emotions. It is the seat of intellectual vision; the head can work out our understanding, but only the heart can open to us material for understanding. For too long in the west the proud head of man has tried to do without the heart, or to treat it as merely the seat of the emotions, a useful but dangerous servant. And inevitably the proud head of man has lost its organic link with reality and tried to replace it with logic. The work of orthodoxy is to bring our minds down from the lofty throne of the head, into the humility of the heart, where reality is to be found.

"The humility of the heart—for the heart is in abasement before the vastness of God: at the same time the historic facts of Christ are seen with intense realism in the intimacy of the holy Spirit by which the heart finds in these facts its own royal freedom."

"The Spirit makes us literally members of Christ. In us the incarnation is continued and the resurrection extends its sphere. And he giveth not the Spirit by measure. As in the incarnation, so in the gift of the Spirit, he gives without reserve. He entrusts himself utterly to us, and that is why he is our judge.

"If we would understand the staggering absoluteness of the Christian faith, we do well to remember our Lord's baptism in Jordan. It is terribly neglected in the west, to the east it is the greatest revelation of the trinity. What is happening here? About the person of Jesus is breaking out into man's sight, not a picture of the trinity, but the very fact of it. That Father's voice proclaiming him, that pure dove-embodied Spirit of the Father's love and hallowing which now descends upon him is no new thing. Unseen it has been happening all through his life. More than that, present before us is the fact which is before Abraham was, before the world began to be created. Here in a point in time is the pure act which contains and transcends all time, and a man is the focus of its manifestation. All that God is, is revealed in immediate reality upon the man Jesus.

“Think on and you find that this is always the Spirit’s work. When the Spirit brooded on the face of the waters, when the Spirit spake by the prophets, when the Spirit overshadowed Mary, always the son remained the goal of the Spirit’s work. The Spirit’s work in creation is always the framing and hallowing of the incarnation. And afterwards it continues so. When the Spirit descended upon the apostles, the Spirit was not merely sent by a Christ remaining aloof. The descent of the Spirit brought Christ again to the apostles by forming him in them and making them his body. And upon this body, as in Jordan, all that God is is shown forth to man.”

THERE IS AN IMMENSE AMOUNT OF ATTENTION GIVEN TO RELIGION, even in this irreligious age. If one had nothing to do but read the new books on Christian subjects alone, he would quickly find he was attempting the impossible. And yet, even aside from shallow and immature productions, one is surprised to find how much of this literature does not seem to comprehend what religion really is. In the minds of many who seek to be leaders of thought in this field, religion is only a form of humanism.

For this reason we ought to pause now and then and take our bearings, just as a navigator does by observing the heavenly bodies. In this short editorial *Zion’s Herald* gives us a reminder for this time of wayward rationalism and defiant atheism:

“All good things in this world are supposed to have roots, and religion is no exception to the rule. For every growth there must be a substratum of substance from which it draws its life. It is generally admitted even by the skeptical that religions have roots, but the present-day affectation, in many quarters, is to represent the faiths of men as originating in superstition, or as the mere products of chance happenings, or tribal custom.

“As a matter of fact, religion originates beyond man—in the nature of God—and in man, by revelation to his enlightened consciousness. Religion is also rooted in human nature, where it is forever calling to the conscience, illuminating the understanding, and innervating the moral choices in favor of things true, lovely, and of good report. Religion is the breathing of

the Spirit of God into the soul of man. It is as natural as life itself, and as inevitable as the atmosphere inhaled by the lungs. Religion is no afterthought, no fifth wheel to the coach of progress, no daydream, or night hallucination. It is the voice of God speaking clearly to the soul of man, and the life of God quickening the faith and hope and love of the redeemed."

IF EVIDENCE PILES UP TO CONVINCE US THAT MEN ARE FORGETTING God and so leaving Him out of all their calculations, it is at least comforting to be reminded that He has not forgotten us, but is ever ready to respond when we turn to Him in sincerity. We are almost tempted to think in these days that God has abandoned the world, that all efforts are useless, and that nothing remains but to speculate upon the nature of the ultimate disaster. *The Lutheran* in these sentences encourages us to remember "the interest of God in the situation":

"In the Mosaic description of the world's beginning, when the earth was waste and void, when darkness was upon the face of the deep, then the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. But not without a purpose. The Spirit 'brooded' over a chaos in order that light and life, seasons and continuance, might displace confusion and sterility. So time and again by means of divinely prepared agencies, the Holy Spirit has moved over desolated areas which the sinful, warring passions of men have reduced to chaos and destruction. The 'home mission' enterprise of a post-war period in the United States was Spirit-guided and Spirit-used. The pioneer preachers who have followed the western drift of people in the United States and Canada are likewise the messengers of the Holy Spirit. The ministry of mercy after the World War has the same holy initiative. And at this time of economic uncertainty, the interest of God in the situation is seen in the desire of Christian men and women everywhere to alleviate distress to sustain courage and to lessen suffering. Make no mistake: the Holy Spirit continues to move upon the face of the waters. Light and life continue to be poured down upon us."

THE PRESENT EMPHASIS UPON ETHICS WITHOUT RELIGIOUS FAITH is accomplishing at least one good thing; it is demonstrating, slowly perhaps, that the two cannot be divorced and prosper.

The mere moral philosopher may demonstrate very satisfactorily the necessity and value of right conduct; but he fails to perceive that there must be an adequate incentive, at least for the average human being. There must be an inner sense of responsibility, and there must be somewhere outside the man himself a source of strength to swim against adverse currents in life and to accomplish unselfish righteousness.

The Christian Century Pulpit publishes a sermon by J. D. Jones upon *The Recovery of the Sense of God*, in which this noted preacher gives the moral law its rightful origin and nature:

"And with the dissolving of the belief in God has come a challenge to the whole Christian ethic. Huxley and Tyndall, whatever may be said of their materialistic philosophy, were men of high ethical standards. I remember hearing Dr. Fairbairn describe John Morley (as he was then) as the best Christian in the cabinet of which he was a member, though he was a professed agnostic and spelled the word 'God' always with a small 'g.' That was the peculiarity of the agnosticism of fifty years ago—while rejecting the Christian faith, it accepted and observed Christian ethics. But that position could not for long be maintained. Flowers will not grow if they have no root, and the Christian ethic has no compulsive authority apart from the Christian belief in God. This is the point Mr. Walter Lippmann stresses in his book, 'A Preface to Morals.' Men no longer believe in a sovereign God, a God who rules this world and who by the hand of Moses issued a moral code for his subjects, and therefore that moral code has lost its binding authority.

"Mr. Lippmann is at any rate logical, though I am left wondering why he speaks of Moses rather than Jesus. For wherein does the authority of the Christian ethic really consist? It consists, in the last analysis, in this—that we believe it to be the expression of the mind and will of Almighty God. The moral law is not something which we have invented. It is not the product of long custom. It is not something which by long experience has been discovered to be right and good. I claim for it a higher authority than that. It derives from Almighty God. It comes to us as the expression of the will of the Creator and Ruler of this world. Holiness, truth, purity, love—they are not expediences simply, things which, on the

whole, the race has discovered to be for its benefit and happiness, they are things which the Lord requires of us and they have behind them divine authority."

THE INTEREST IN ARCHEOLOGY CONTINUES. NOT ONLY SO, BUT Biblical archeology obviously holds the chief attention, for most people have at least a little interest in anything that may tend to confirm the Bible. So great an attraction has this whole subject for scholars that it is at present proper to refer to "numerous archaeological expeditions which are at present working in the Near East." It is to be remembered that we are largely dependent upon the Bible for our knowledge of Palestinian history; yet it is now realized that considerable contributions may be made to it—even are being made to it—by the spade. The archeologists are "filling up gaps in the chronological scheme, and revealing the movements that come at various periods from Egypt, Syria, Babylonia, Cyprus, and the Ægean."

In a brief article, compact with information, Rev. J. W. Jack has reviewed, in *The Expository Times*, recent work done in this region. These extracts give some idea of the importance of the results:

"Professor Garstang, for example, by his recent careful and thorough examination of buried Jericho, has succeeded in determining the precise date of its destruction. For twenty years the prevalent idea among many scholars, based on the conclusions of Drs. Watzinger and Sellin, has been that the city was destroyed soon after 1600 B.C. (the beginning of the Late Bronze Age), and that consequently the site in Joshua's time was desolate, 'a heap of ruins on which stood perhaps a few isolated huts.' But Professor Garstang, with the independent assistance in certain matters of Père Vincent and Dr. Clarence Fisher, has produced clear evidences that the solid inner brick wall, about twelve feet thick, was not constructed till the Late Bronze Age, and was destroyed about 1400 B.C., the destruction being shown by reddened masses of burnt bricks, grey ash, and other traces of intense fire. The date has been partly reached from the important fact that not a single fragment of Mycenæan ware has been found among the ten thousand

potsherds associated with the destruction of the walls or among the remaining fifty thousand found in the ruins of the city. As it is known that this type of pottery entered Palestine about 1350 B.C., and a specimen of it has been found just outside the walls, it is clear that the destruction of Jericho took place about 1400 B.C., the precise date of the invasion of Palestine by the Habiru, who are usually identified with the Hebrews, an invasion described in the famous *Tell el-Amarna* Letters. This unanimous conclusion of the excavators is of great interest and importance, as the date assigned corresponds with that of the Biblical Joshua."

"A vast amount of exploration, in the interests of archæology, has recently been made in Babylonia. Much of it throws a welcome light on Hebrew tradition and history. At Ur, the home of Abraham, the work has brought to light material evidence of the Flood. After digging down thirty feet or more (over an area thirty yards by twenty yards), through no less than eight old civilizations, one above the other, the excavators suddenly came upon a seam of perfectly clean sand, water-laid and about eleven feet in thickness. This sand could only have been due to an immense Flood. The excavators dug down below the sand into the prediluvian stratum, and found there mud floors, household rubbish, sherds of pottery, and other signs of human occupation, as well as graves with coloured pottery and with clay figurines which seem to have a religious connexion. At one point was a great tumbled mass of red and black material, evidently the remains of a reed hut plastered with clay which had been burned down before the Flood. Close to the hut were found some real clay bricks, showing that the people of that distant age also lived in brick buildings—a proof of a much higher state of civilization than would have been expected. Here, six thousand or more years ago, the inhabitants dwelt till the Flood came, depositing a deep layer of sand over the top of everything. All this is supported by the remarkable excavations recently carried out at Kish near Babylon, over one hundred miles north of Ur, by Mr. L. Ch. Watelin and others, with the collaboration of Professor Langdon of Oxford. Below the deep, upper stratum they came on a similar thick layer of sand, and beneath this they struck the prediluvian civilization. At a depth of twenty-one feet beneath the sand they found the early tombs of the mighty men of Kish, who lived long before the days of Noah. By sinking some shafts nine feet lower still, to virgin soil, they

discovered painted ware, neolithic implements, and other signs of the earliest population that existed in Mesopotamia, certainly before 5000 B.C. It is clear that Babylonia contains secrets of the utmost importance, which may yet throw a marvellous light on the early chapters of Genesis."

IT IS NATURAL, AND INEVITABLE, FOR THE CHURCH TO SEEK SOME means of shielding its young people from unfavorable worldly influences. In a sense there is competition here between church and world, but it need not be competition on the same plane. The aims are utterly diverse, and the methods must be different. To save young folks from gatherings and resorts where the influence is undeniably hostile to religion and morality it is not necessary for the church to try to duplicate these attractions even when shorn of their worst features. Aside from other unfavorable elements such attempts are so obviously imitations, and poor imitations at that, as to defeat their very purpose. If a game usually played for gambling purposes is introduced into church recreation rooms, minus its gambling side, it seems decidedly tame to any young person who has played it as a means of betting.

It is often argued that the recreational facilities are a means of attracting young folks to the church. However, the tendency is to attract only to the church building, even until it is open more hours a week for pleasure than for worship; while the church as an institution of great vital and historic meaning is but dimly seen. In a paper in *The Presbyterian* upon What a Banker Expects of His Church, Mr. Hugh R. Monro says on this matter of recreation:

"So far as my acquaintance among the intelligent laity goes, there is no extensive demand for the multiplied social and recreational facilities which have become so prominent in many churches. Heads of families are sympathetic with the idea that the Church should seek to enlist and hold the interest of their young people and afford opportunity for wholesome companionship, but are far from persuaded that the attempt to compete with the theater, the movie, and the public dance will accomplish that end. I distinctly disavow holding any narrow,

puritanical views concerning the social activities of young people. The Christian Church, no doubt, has a measure of social responsibility on their behalf. And yet it is significant that churches which greatly extend their activity in this direction invariably do so at the expense of spiritual interest, while others which uphold the spiritual ideal and present to the young the deeper satisfactions which attach to the culture and enrichment of the soul, are most successful in developing character and leadership. Indeed, I have come to the conclusion that, in general, these social, educational and recreational facilities are a distinct liability. It is safe to apply the single test to all such undertakings: Will it tend directly toward the spiritual end for which the Church exists?"

CHURCH MUSIC, SPEAKING BROADLY, SHOWS GREAT ROOM FOR improvement. This is chiefly true in the matter of congregational singing; for, in many churches, what ought to be an important and inspiring part of the service is largely delegated to the choir, and frequently such music is fine rather than uplifting. But we may hope for better things here, for lately the whole subject of church music has been receiving greater attention than for some time. Cecil M. Smith closes *Some Observations Upon American Religious Music*, in *The Chicago Theological Seminary Register*, with this hopeful word:

"But there are some rays of hope for the future. American composers are daily becoming more resourceful, and each new season marks an advance on their part toward the discovery of lastingly beautiful musical inspiration. Choirs the country over are showing a revived interest in the religious classics, and are preparing the way for a critical appreciation of a noble literature of American religious music, when that literature finally emerges from the present chaos. Religion is approaching a new transcendental definition; and music is the vehicle of the soaring spirit. I dare to hope, even to prophecy, that few generations will pass before American choirs and congregations will sing music that will be a genuine expression of our patriotic and religious idealism."

STATISTICS BEAR A VERY DIRECT RELATION TO THE WORTH OR standing of many organizations, but with others they are apt to be misleading or even valueless. Church statistics are a

source of continual study and comment, yet how far can we rely upon them to show us the power or weakness of the church at any particular time? The fact that figures form a poor index was demonstrated lately by H. Paul Douglass, Director, Institute of Social and Religious Research, in a study of the present condition of our American churches, given in *Current History* (copyright, published by the New York Times Company). Mr. Douglass shows that, as an organization, the church in this country gives abundant evidence of being permanent. What he does not, of course, explain is why irreligion, crime, general disregard of law, and low moral standards have shown such an increase in late years during which the church has on the whole grown faster than population. Some of the figures he gives may be cited. We have 212 denominations, maintaining 232,000 churches, which have a combined membership of 44,380,000 persons thirteen years old and over, about 35 per cent. of the population. The writer closes with this summary, which is both encouraging and sobering:

"The total body of evidence shows that organized religion is growing considerably more rapidly than is population, and that considered in its whole length and breadth, the Church as an enterprise is considerably more than holding its own. Of its lapse or ultimate disappearance one finds no evidence in objective trends covering the first three decades of the twentieth century. To say this is not to deny that much suggests a vast institution keeping up with the age in its externals, but scarcely a thing of originality or keen adaptation. This is enough to give pause to optimism. Many thoughtful minds also doubt whether the value of the Church is commensurate with its bulk and power. Even so, we should be unwilling to be stampeded in our judgment of the times when ecclesiastics with little perspective and short memories report that Church business is bad, or when secularists, with no feeling for the meaning that the Church has for others, assume that it is upon the rocks. It is quite possible too that the reaction against the notion of the Church as the synonym of religion has tended to understate the sense in which it is the symptom of religion. If men keep guarding and cherishing this confessedly earthen vessel, it must be because they still find treasure in it."

"IT IS ASSERTED," REMARKS THE WRITER OF A BOOK NOTE IN *The Expository Times*, "that serious psychological publications number over two thousand a year. Those that are not serious must be as the sand on the seashore. The air is full of psychological jargon." He is referring to the Bampton Lectures for 1930, delivered by Professor L. W. Grensted of Oxford, whose subject was *Psychology and God*. In giving Professor Grensted's position he gives us this cautionary word respecting the influence of the present psychology upon religion:

"Professor Grensted is well aware of the vital character of the issues with which he deals. The 'New Psychology' he rightly regards as *the* enemy of religious faith in our generation, largely because of the insidious and plausible nature of its analysis. Religious belief is dissolved either as a projection of our own comfortable illusion or as the result of suggestion. In his riposte the author does not seem to us to make enough of the obvious *tu quoque* to which the new psychologist exposes himself. If our religious beliefs are purely subjective, the same analysis that leads to such a conclusion dissolves belief in any objectivity whatever. The experience of the religious soul has the same right of way as any other experience. It is *semper et ubique* the same essentially. This contention is doubtless implied in much of the argument in these chapters, but it is not given a sufficiently definite form.

"The author takes his stand on certain basic facts—freedom, the experience of worth or value, and above all else the experience of otherness. We are continually aware, so far as we are aware of ourselves at all, of a relationship with that which is not ourselves. This is fundamental to the whole life-process. The ego is never pure, self-contained, self-conditioned. It cannot be observed in isolation from that to which it is related. It looks beyond itself to *persons*, and things have only meaning (perhaps only existence) as the vehicles of such personal relationships. And this inevitably leads up to the hypothesis of a personal God."

IF PSYCHOLOGY IS REALLY ENTITLED TO BE COUNTED AS A science it is at least the most youthful member of the scientific family, and has all the strut of confident adolescence. It is

still, therefore, in its formative period. Yet this does not mean that it lacks sound principles or that it has added nothing to our knowledge of our minds. It has done and is doing commendable work, and it has the added recommendation of having a fascination all its own, for it comes closer to each of us than any other science.

Its danger and its unfortunate influences arise from its too confident assumptions and from its disposition to occupy territory not belonging to it. This item from *The Evangelical Christian* gives specific emphasis to what we are saying:

"That mental processes and brain functions are legitimate subjects of observation and study cannot be denied. Moreover, psychology has been admitted to its place as a branch of science. But that it has assumed all too much in the sphere of the ethical and spiritual has been long suspected.

"Denying to religion its well established verities it assumed a dogmatism unwarranted in this sphere.

"It is interesting, therefore, to see its own assumptions passing under the fire of criticism at the hands of other scientific investigators. Writing in 'The Scientific Monthly,' Professor Dunlop of the Johns Hopkins University makes the following scathing arraignment of the matter: '*Most text books of psychology are epitomes of discarded theories and exploded facts, and the primary work with graduate students is to purge them of the rubbish they have learned in elementary courses.*'

"Much teaching on Psychology has been used to discount the supernatural operations and to shake faith in Christian theology. It is interesting to see science itself raising questions of faith in psychology. The devotion of time spent in the study of these discarded text books of psychology to the study of the Scriptures would give more wisdom and understanding in true mental philosophy and beget wholesome spirituality and uplifting faith instead of landing the mind in the quagmire of unbelief."

UPON THE WHOLE PROBLEM OF REARING CHILDREN THERE IS NO more illogical idea put forth than that children should not be given religious training until they are old enough to think about

and decide such questions for themselves. This is the easy and dangerous excuse of parents who shirk such responsibility, either because they are too indifferent themselves or too lazy to meet their moral obligations to their children, or because they are woefully ignorant of child nature. *The Baptist* has this sane paragraph on the subject:

"Many oppose, and the Russian government forbids, giving religious teaching to children. The principle of the opposition is that the child has a right to grow in its own natural way to intellectual and religious maturity, free from any bias toward views of its elders. The *Chinese Recorder* notes that a bias toward spiritual ideals and a socializing faith is just as reasonable as a bias toward the preservation of health or toward a sound and trained intellect. Can anybody conceive that a child is injured by growing up with a belief that it lives in a world in which good life is worth living? Is not such a bias a blessing to all who may be affected by it? Is not any wholesome society vitally concerned to have such a bias definitely fixed in the mind and character of its children? And is not such a faith the very heart of religious teaching? The teaching of such a faith may be implemented by a lot of cumbrous creedal and ecclesiastical machinery. If so, scrap or mend the machinery. But distinguish between rubbish and life. Even yet it is hardly good clinical practice to throw out the baby with the bath."

MODERN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS ARE THE OBJECTS OF CONTINUAL examination and criticism. Out of this much good ought to come, for there is still much room for improvement in our schools and colleges. One of their mistakes seems to be that the student must be given a little of everything, the idea being to fill his mind rather than to teach him how to use it. After all, the great educator is experience, and the young student's training should be devoted chiefly to fitting him to meet experience, to grasp it, to make the most of it, to escape its unfavorable influences.

Writing upon certain phases of education, in *The Saturday Review of Literature*, Bernard Iddings Bell, Warden of St. Stephen's College, shows that college education today actually

fails to teach the student how to use his mental powers. As a result he is unfitted to take up graduate and professional studies, which demand a well disciplined mind. Dr. Bell is an educator and writer of note, and this warning of his at least deserves consideration:

“As a plain matter of fact, most college freshmen, charming lads and lasses though in many ways they be, cannot do the things that may reasonably be expected of them. They cannot look at a thing and tell you what they see; listen to sounds and know what it is they hear; by the touch truly perceive form; know how others feel and why; read, write, speak with any sure knowledge of how words are to be handled or of what other people’s phrases really mean; or, finally, think in general terms as distinct from specific and concrete things. It is difficult properly to teach them science when they know next to nothing about sense perceptiveness; to instruct them in morals, manners, politics, history or religion, until they have learned to evaluate and respect other persons; to impart knowledge of philosophy to those who do not know what ‘abstract’ means; or to do much of anything with them until one has taught them to read, write, and speak. In consequence, colleges with sadness expect to devote at least half of the four short years in which they have their students to an attempt to supply to those students the training which ought previously to have been given. At eighteen years of age, an English lad or one on the continent, if he has mind enough to justify his going to the university, is ready for the university. At the same age in this country he is mostly an untrained young cub. It takes the Junior College years and sometimes the Senior College years as well, to lick him into such shape that he may begin to work for himself at a scholarly task. The most tragic part of this tragic situation is that frequently it is then too late to do anything with him. An undergraduate with flabby mental habits acquired in a school where he has been permitted to devote his best formative years to playing around in the fields of general information, is often incapable of learning later on even the elements of the trade of thought. It used to be true that only the dull or the lax were failed out of college; but nowadays many a boy or girl must leave whose innate intelligence is all right and who is truly industrious, but who has never been taught the elements of thinking, who is the victim of school malpractice.”

THE PRESENT GREAT DEMAND FOR VOCATIONAL TRAINING, IN things designed to contribute to one's success in gaining money, has wrought a great change in the educational world. If, in fact, we compare our modern technical and professional with the older cultural education, we discover that in reality something like a revolution has occurred during the past half-century or thereabouts in the college and university world.

But now there are some evidences of a reactionary movement, though no one can predict what it will amount to. More voices each year are heard in praise of the classics, of the old classical learning of our college bred ancestors. A recent book review stated that this hopeful tendency is evidenced by a new and improved edition of a Greek grammar that was a standard about fifty years ago. As to the neglect of the more enduring and satisfying learning, though it is still offered, Dr. William Dibelius, writing in *The Spectator* upon Universities in Danger, says of the conditions that have changed the universities:

"About half a century ago University reformers in England were heavily assailing the University of the Oxford and Cambridge type. The University contributed very little toward the academic needs of the nation. It shamefully neglected all modern requirements. It had no room for the modern engineer or modern languages; it was simply maintaining a small class of young men in idleness and gave to a few of the idle rich a certain humanistic aspect of life which was no longer required by the times. Germany, France, and America were held out as examples of how a University might be made a really popular and modern institution.

"Since that time University reformers have completely won the battle. Many points in detail may still demand adjustment or reform; in principle the battle is won. Anybody may study Modern Languages, Science, and Applied Science to his heart's content. The student, further, is drawn from all classes of the population. Single Universities may not come up to the point desired by the reformers. On the whole, however, it must be admitted that no considerable talent in the lower orders is neglected, that the 'poure scholar' of the Middle Ages has come to his own again."

"The modern generation as a whole is woefully lacking in

historic interest. They have an interest in life as it is, but not in life as it was centuries ago. The interest in things of the past is confined to a minority. It will mostly—not exclusively—be found among those who come from families with a certain traditional background. The majority of those who come from humble homes in which things of the past are rarely discussed will very often consider old historic values as mere trash. They may have their own interests, political or technical; they love sport and whatever can give them a stronger sense of actual realities, but old times mean little or nothing to them. This attitude of a large number of modern students is a real danger to the idea of the University. The present University (though not the University of the sixteenth or eighteenth century) claims to give a wider horizon to its students by initiating them into the great past. It claims to elevate a man's soul by showing him that a large part of his modern ideas and conceptions have already been thought by men of remote centuries, by making them feel a kind of spiritual fellowship with the great of the past. A large part of the message of the University consists in this feeling of largeness, and a generation which is resolved to live merely in itself, which is apt to dismiss Shakespeare and Goethe with an impatient sneer, is hardly fit to profit from the University as it now is."

STANDARDIZATION IS NOT CONFINED TO MANUFACTURING. As modern Western civilization extends its influence over the world the lives of people tend more and more toward uniformity in various ways. The Western fashion of dress, for example, is being adopted everywhere, so are our educational ideas and our business methods. Even our indifference to the demands of a positive and definite religious faith is influencing those we not long since numbered among the "heathen." Stephen Leacock writes in *The Spectator* of this "sameness" that is creeping over the world, and he indicates the increasing difficulties of the independent thinker and worker when he says:

"The great 'sameness' which is to envelope and stifle mankind has already begun. Universal communication rapidly begets universal similarity. The word 'standardization' has already come uppermost in the industrial world. Standardized machines turn out products of incomparable uniformity. Divergencies and differences drop out. They cost too much.

Hence, as the age of the great sameness draws on, all men will more and more be found to be more and more alike, and they will wear the same clothes buttoned in the same way, fashioned probably in a rather infantile style. It is clear already from the amazing spread of Miniature Golf, Tom Thumb Tennis, and Dicky Bird Football, that grown-up people revert easily to the costume of the child.

"But the greatest changes and the greatest sameness will be those in the things of intellect and education. Already all our schools are being framed on the same model, with the same text-books, the same 'readers,' the same recitations, the same standardized literature and adjustable patriotism. There is already no way to tell one teacher from another except by their finger prints. Even those will soon look alike. This uniformity of the schools and school-teaching will spread all over the world. It is America's revenge on the people who discovered it. The infinite variety of the Old World will be replaced by the prosaic uniformity of the New."

THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD NO LONGER POSSESS THE COMPARATIVE independence of one another that characterized them in other times. Modern facilities for communication, travel, trade, and interchange of ideas have brought them so close together as to raise problems our fathers never had to face. The spirit of nationalism has been emphasized by the fears and jealousies of peoples that are living in closer relations than ever before with other peoples of like feelings and antagonisms. Present educational systems should take cognizance of these things in preparing young people for life in a world that seeks a great readjustment. Canon Raven of Liverpool, in addressing a company of young people in America, uttered these words:

"You in this great and prosperous land do not realize, as we in the old world do, that, unless mankind in your lifetime achieves world unity, it will certainly achieve world wide disaster. You may think yourself separate from the troubles of Europe, but I tell you with absolute conviction that the distresses which we are feeling now, you will feel in less than a generation, unless you secure for the world the basis for a sane and cooperative society. Not even you will be able to stand the economic, financial, and political pressure of India, China,

and Japan, if those infinitely resourceful people become industrialized and antagonistic."

WHATEVER RUSSIA IS, OR IS GOING TO BE, IT IS BECOMING QUITE clear that she must be taken seriously. The commercial world is disturbed over the possible success of the Five Year Plan, which aims to put Russia in a position to influence prices of basic materials and staple products throughout the world. If it does succeed, industrial life everywhere will be affected. But, be this as it may, the church has an interest of her own in the Russian situation, for here is a nation that has not only overturned a corrupt state church, but has deliberately set about the suppression of all religion everywhere.

We may put an embargo on Russian wheat, but it is too late, if it was ever possible, to prevent the infiltration and spread of atheistic propaganda. Already national atheism in that country is reflected in organized atheism in our own, and that of a type which has even penetrated our colleges.

The European Harvest Field has published a most earnest warning to the church of the West, written by Professor V. Martzinkovski. He deals with the religious situation in Russia, and seeks to rouse the church in more favored lands to watchful activity. These references to the weakness of a half-hearted and even indifferent Christianity are especially pertinent:

"We Russians have come to you of the West out of a burning house. You wish to put out the fire. But, as Dostoyefski has truthfully said, 'The fire is not on the roofs of the houses, but in the minds of men.' If we cared to make a complaint to the West, it would perhaps be concerning itself. We would like to warn it of the danger presented by that half-way Christianity which prepares a soil favorable to atheism. We would like to testify to the West regarding the real nature of atheism, when it is carried out in actual life."

"We appeal to the West not for aid in the form of blockades or intervention. We have not come here to sing to you, while you continue to sleep peacefully on the pillow of bourgeois Christianity. We have come out of a burning building. But you, our Western brethren, live in the same building, only

in the next higher story. The worldwide conflagration will spread even hither. Have you not noticed the smell of smoke? 'The hour of temptation . . . shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth.' They only shall endure who stand upon the rock of a vital and practical confession of Christ. That Christianity will be overthrown which is professed by those who believe in God but live as though He were not.

"This false piety in considerable part inspired the anti-religious protest of the Revolution, and it contributes to the success of atheism. Religion without righteous living, social justice, and freedom, led to a life without religion, to a choice of destruction, and the abyss of emptiness. Such is the terrible lesson of the Revolution for believing men. And to the unbelieving we address the question, 'Do you wish to bring yourselves and your nation to the sort of spiritual and temporal ruin which atheism has brought into Russia?'"

SOME PEOPLE, EVEN IN THE CHURCH, SEEM QUITE SENSITIVE about the propriety of sending missionaries into non-Christian lands. It seems to such minds especially uncalled for that Protestant missionaries should work in Roman Catholic countries. Of course, the general answer to this is, that any individual or group has a right to propagate any ideas not contrary to morals or subversive to good government. But in the matter of Protestant propaganda in Roman countries the answer to the objection lies in the needs of the people there, after Romanism has long had its opportunity. This is illustrated effectively in the case of South America, as summed up in this way by *The Watchman-Examiner*:

"Every country on earth where Roman Catholicism has had full sway and undisputed sway is a missionary land. We can illustrate our meaning by referring particularly to Latin America. For nearly four centuries the Roman Catholic Church has had absolute sway in these countries, and gradually, because of its political alliances, its autocratic methods and its internal corruption, it has alienated the people and lost its grip. Half the people of Latin America are in heathen darkness, and the other half are turning away from the Church that has failed in its God-appointed task. There is no disposition on the part of anybody to lay the lash on Catholicism, but

there is a deep and abiding conviction on the part of those who have spent years in studying Latin American conditions that Romanism has been a curse rather than a blessing to these Latin American peoples, because it has misled millions, has lulled millions more to sleep in carnal security, and has winked at every form of worldliness and corruption. From this false interpretation of Christianity the people have turned to skepticism and infidelity, and it is more difficult now to reach them with the gospel than it is to reach those who have never heard of the gospel. Let it be remembered that the Romanism of these countries is not the more or less enlightened Romanism of the United States and England, the Romanism purified by its contact with Protestantism, but the pre-Reformation Romanism, the Romanism of superstition and corruption. That out of this darkness some noble Christians have come nobody doubts, but that the nations have turned in disgust from such a religion no intelligent man will deny. These millions of people are in darkness except for the light that flashes from an occasional little chapel where mission work is maintained by some one of our great missionary societies."

WILL THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT AMONG THE AMERICAN NEGROES continue to be prominently Protestant, or is there an appreciable drift toward Romanism? Because of his deeply emotional and highly demonstrative expressions of faith in doctrines that are central among leading Protestant communions, we have complacently assumed that the colored man in America is a fixture in Protestantism. Yet, as though in harmony with the revolutionary spirit of the age, there is evidence that he is becoming attracted to the Roman Catholic Church. The rather startling announcement is made that, at the present rate, even the majority of Negroes will soon change radically their church affiliations.

A new book, *Negro—National Asset or Liability*, by Dr. John Louis Hill, Southern by birth and tradition and long a student of the American Negro, contains statements that may well set Protestant leaders to giving more serious attention to this problem. An advance book notice sent out by Literary Associates, Inc., quotes some statements that are sufficiently striking to be given here:

"More than half of the adult Negro population in America is identified with some church or other. A very large majority of Negro church-members in the United States belong to Protestant denominations. But from a careful analysis of all the churches, and of the forms of worship in the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, and of the Negro's mental makeup and natural tendencies, the inevitable conclusion must be that most Negroes are Protestant because of their early religious environment. Their religious history had its beginning in the South where the Protestant churches predominated, and naturally, the colored churches became Baptist or Methodist, or Presbyterian, or what not, because they were patterned after the white churches which were the only models they had at hand. Those organizations, from their humble beginnings, have spread far and wide over the country at large, and have taken on such proportions that their membership is now numbered among the millions. The largest among them is Baptist, with the A. M. E. Zion perhaps ranking second. Practically all of the Protestant religious bodies in America are represented by Negro organizations.

"Though small in number, there are some colored Episcopalian and Roman Catholic churches. In some of the cities where there are no colored Roman Catholic congregations, a sprinkling of Negroes here and there, are communicants of white Roman Catholic churches.

"It is significant that within the last decade, the proportionate number of Negroes becoming Episcopalians and Catholics, particularly the latter, has rapidly increased. This fact, together with a careful study of Negro psychology and the peculiarities of the Episcopalian and Catholic churches, lead the writer to make a prediction which of course may, or may not come true. Holding no brief for any church, and in this connection disclaiming any bias for or against any religious body, the writer believes that within another half century a much larger proportion of American religionists classed as Negroes, will become members of the two last mentioned religious bodies, with more of them Catholic than Episcopalian.

"This prediction is based upon well-known facts relative to the Negro's nature, and upon the doctrines and the forms of worship of these churches. As regards the Negro himself, his mind and his artistic and dramatic nature quickly sense and readily react to the colorful, the theatrical, the 'pomp and circumstance,' and to the dramatic, in expression of all things.

In this sense, the Episcopalian service and the High Mass of the Roman Catholic church render complete satisfaction to the natural demands of the Negro's mental and artistic being. There is not enough force in adverse conditions and circumstances to always keep separated a people and systems and forms of worship as naturally adapted and as completely conforming to each other as are the colored people and the two above mentioned churches."

THAT THERE ARE LEADERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WHO of set purpose are seeking to deliver that great communion over to Rome is of course well known. The recent Lambeth Conference drew attention again to this fact. *The Evangelical Christian* (Toronto), in commenting on this ecclesiastical situation in England, has uttered this warning:

"The publication of the report of the Lambeth Conference of the Bishops has created considerable comment in England. Ten years ago when the talk of organic union was rife throughout the world, a committee was appointed by the Conference to look into the matter of a possible re-union with the Free Churches of the Old Land. The result of these deliberations as expressed at the recent conference in England can only be called disappointing. It is most apparent that the Bishops are more sympathetic to union with Rome, and are obviously dominated in their findings by the Anglo-Catholic element within their ranks. Ten years has not changed their attitude towards the Free Churches. They are only 'communions' not to be admitted as true ministers of the Word and the Sacraments.

"It is a pitiful situation. God may own and bless the work of the Free Churches, as He undoubtedly has done at home and abroad, but, as a prominent English periodical has pointed out, the Lambeth Bishops are more particular. The undoubted drift of a section of the Anglican Church, as the Lambeth deliberations have shown, is Romeward. It will be a sorry day indeed should that day ever dawn when this great Church of England places herself again under the yoke of Rome, fetters her convictions to the Vatican, and turns back the clock of the Reformation.

"The day she submits to Rome, she ceases to be English. It is as inconsistent with the mind and heart of a Britisher to accept the temporal and spiritual domination of an Italian

priest as it would be to accept the political dictation of an Italian king.

"The coming years will be fraught with peril for the great Church of England. May her leaders be given wisdom to discern the sign of the times before it is too late."

INDIA IS A CENTER OF WORLD INTEREST, AND IT PROMISES TO BE for some time. Nearly all news from that country is now given serious attention. What of religion there, and especially is Christianity making any progress? Whatever be the outcome of the political and social questions now vexing India, the Christian church has reason to take courage from this comment upon the missionaries and their accomplishments, as it appears in the Simon report:

"They have avoided giving offence to Hindus and Moslems, and they have lived in peace and unity with the people of all religions. Their work, too, has been successful. There are now 4,500,000 Indian Christians, a fact of which we can hardly measure the significance. In education the work of the missionaries has had astonishing results. Throughout the whole of India more than 90 percent are illiterate, although they are largely drawn from the depressed classes, the untouchables."

THE OPPOSERS OF THE PROHIBITION AMENDMENT ARE UNTIRING in their efforts to belittle its results and to prophesy woe if it is not soon repealed. This adverse propaganda doubtless has a more far-reaching effect in the North Atlantic States, with their large foreign population, than in any other part of the country. This amendment has its enemies everywhere, however, and their determination to have it repealed—or to nullify it if not repealed—will probably play a large part in political campaigns for some time to come, as it did during the past fall. But has prohibition proved a failure? Irving Fisher, Professor of Economics in Yale University, has given his testimony upon the matter in an analysis of results that appeared in *The Christian Century*. After referring to financial gains due to prohibition Professor Fisher says:

"But in a pamphlet issued early this month by the Asso-

ciation Against the Prohibition Amendment, entitled 'Does Prohibition Pay?' my estimate of economic gains from prohibition is challenged. This pamphlet declares that the annual bill for intoxicating drinks in the United States has increased from \$1,817,000,000 in 1913 to \$2,848,000,000 in 1929. Accepting the association's figures for the moment, and for the sake of argument, this estimate is largely destroyed by the fact that it has not taken into account the changed purchasing power of the dollar in 1929 as compared with 1913. The dollar of 1913 would buy 57 per cent more goods than the dollar of 1929. That means that the estimated drink bill of \$1,817,000,000 in 1913 was equivalent in purchasing power to \$2,850,700,000 in 1929; this is in excess of the \$2,848,000,000 which the anti-prohibition association reckons to be the drink bill for 1929. Moreover, since 1913 the population has increased from 96,000,000 persons to about 122,000,000, as of 1929. So, according to the figures adduced by the anti-prohibition association itself, the per capita drink bill has shrunk on this account by 21 per cent.

"It is also to be noted that the actual sacrifices in money today in buying bootleg liquor are not properly comparable with the sacrifices before national prohibition. This is because the patrons of bootleggers are today in the upper strata of income receivers, whereas in the days of the saloon they were in all strata, including the poorest. It should be borne in mind that only one per cent of income receivers receive more than \$9,000 a year income. With bootleg liquors increasing in price in proportion to the risks of outlawry and with the disappearance of the saloon, expenditure on liquor by the rich has become a luxury item. But under the saloon régime, the expenditures for liquor were a crushing burden on the poor. It is quite unfair to compare \$100 expenditure of hard-earned wages by a poor workman in 1913 with \$100 spent now by a man who can afford it. So the economic burden of drink, even if the figures were exactly the same as in 1913, after all allowances for population, purchasing power of the dollar and so on, which the Association Against the Prohibition Amendment has omitted, would be immensely greater before prohibition than today.

"The real economic damage from drink, however, comes from the consumption rather than from the money cost of liquor. The waste of productive power caused by drink has been reduced as drinking has been reduced. The vital question

is the amount of drinking. It is here that the public is being most deceived. Yet even the statisticians hired by the anti-prohibitionists have not been able to figure out so much drinking as before prohibition. Fortunately we have just had the benefit of an official estimate issued by the federal prohibition bureau under Colonel Woodcock. The millions of people who have been deluded into thinking that there is more drinking than before prohibition must have been amazed to read in the big headlines that Colonel Woodcock cannot figure more than 40 per cent of the old-time consumption.

"Those who went beyond the headlines found that even this figure is much too big; that it relates to gallons of beverage, not gallons of alcohol. The corresponding for gallons of actual alcohol is 35 per cent of pre-prohibition figures. These figures apply to total consumption, not per capita consumption. The per capita consumption worked out as only 27 per cent of pre-prohibition consumption. This means that per capita consumption, which, of course, is the really important figure, has been reduced since prohibition by at least 73 per cent."

BOOKS

THE DECLINE OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH¹

THE MOST NOTABLE contribution of the past year to church history, and a work of utmost value and interest to the teacher, student, and lay reader alike, is *The Decline of the Medieval Church* by Alexander Clarence Flick.

In the field of church history—it ought to be so in every field, in fact—a new book is justified if it either contributes something new or tells something familiar in a better way than it has been told before. The two-volume work under review does both. To be sure, most of what Dr. Flick has done is not new, if by new one means something not hitherto known to historians. Dr. Flick advances no fresh hypothesis and offers no novel discovery to add to the field of knowledge. The originality of the work is in the fact that it is based on and contains a mass of material new to English readers and hard to find elsewhere. It has the freshness of new data; it is full of facts which the lay reader has been told existed, but which he is likely to have had little opportunity to scan for himself.

On the other hand, these volume constitute the most comprehensive, well-balanced, and carefully authenticated attempt ever made to set forth the abuses and forces which brought about the decay of the medieval church. None of Dr. Flick's predecessors in this field has equalled him in the scope and completeness of his discussion. He has covered every aspect of this particular segment of history with an unfailing sense of proportion and with a wealth of detail.

It is this last mentioned feature which most justifies the assertion that a familiar story has been told here in a better way than ever before. Others have written in detail on the so-called Babylonian Captivity, for instance, but none has done

¹ *The Decline of the Medieval Church*. By Alexander Clarence Flick, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930. Two volumes. Volume One, pp. xiv+398. Sources. Volume Two, pp. xiv+543. Sources. Index, for both volumes, by E. M. White.

it as thoroughly as Dr. Flick. Schaff gives the best account, in the knowledge of this reviewer anyway, of the Avignon financial system hitherto available to English readers. But the extent of his discussion is about fourteen pages. In the present work the same subject occupies eighty-two pages. This characteristic holds true of the presentation of the other phases of the period surveyed.

We have no hesitation, therefore, in stating that here is a historical masterpiece, reflecting genuine scholarship and a thorough acquaintance with the underlying facts. Dr. Flick, who formerly was professor of European history and head of the department of history at Syracuse University and who is now state historian of New York, gathered this material during a long residence in Europe where he worked with several leading historians and carried on extensive research in the great libraries of the principal capitals. This use of original sources makes the work authoritative and of utmost value to all students of church history. As Dr. Flick knows, when one neglects the sources anything can happen to history. It has been the weakness of much written history that one author but continues the error of his predecessors. This Dr. Flick has well avoided by his constant dependence on, and reference to, the documents.

The title indicates the particular focus in which the history of the church during the later Middle Ages is viewed. This work is concerned with the forces which undermined and finally led to the disruption of the medieval church. In dealing with these forces the author has no other thesis as his informing idea than the relation these forces bear to the deterioration of ecclesiastical power and supremacy.² One could not ask for a work freer of propaganda, more definitely objective in subject matter or more scientific in spirit.

The plan of presenting the material is very simple and follows the usual procedure for this period. The two volumes comprise four main parts, the first three setting forth successive aspects of ecclesiastical history during this period, namely, the Babylonian Captivity, the great Western schism, and the

conciliar era. The fourth section deals with the Renaissance in its relation to the church. In each division the forces which made for the disruption of the power and influence of the medieval church are noted and discussed. In general it is seen that the forces appearing in the first three eras are negative and destructive, while those presented in the section on the Renaissance are positive and constructive.

One might well describe this work as a study in the logic of history. Viewed in proper perspective, no movement of importance is accidental or revolutionary. Evolution as a principle is true of history. Things do not happen; they are the result of inner forces which may indeed be accelerated at times to the point of seeming revolutionary when they are not.

When one has completed the survey of the facts and conditions marshalled by Dr. Flick he is impressed with the inevitability of the final outcome. The Protestant Reformation came because it had to be. And so one sees how the church was weakened by the Avignon residence, by the schism and strife which followed the return of the Papal See to Rome, by the fierce contest between the popes and the councils. One sees also how this long and steady decline was punctuated from time to time by sincere attempts at internal reform which failed because they were too early, because the right time and the right man had not yet met. At the same time various forces—religious, ecclesiastical, political, social, and economic—were at work which finally came to inevitable fruition in the Reformation.

Several special emphases which Dr. Flick makes with respect to the forces affecting the breakdown of ecclesiastical authority should be noted in passing. The first is that it was the financial policy of the Avignon popes which gave to the Babylonian Captivity an injurious effect on the papal position. The Avignon residence itself led to an "increase and centralization of Papal power" (I, p. 86). But this was more than offset by the other great characteristic of the exile from Rome, namely, the development of the Avignon fiscal policy which

"contributed more than is generally supposed to the undermining of Papal authority" (I, p. 179). Mention has already been made of the great detail with which Dr. Flick develops this subject and of the wealth of facts which support his illuminating discussion. Nothing seems beyond the possibility of becoming a source of papal income.

"Every service the Church had to give, every privilege it had within its power to confer, and every possible appointment to position high or low, were exploited in one way or another by the Papal curia" (I, p. 89).

One reads of fees for a permit to a king to carry his sword on Christmas Day, to a king to legitimize his illegitimate children, to a sick nun to go home, to divide a dead man and put him in two graves, to enjoy freedom from fasting, to a city to establish a school, *et cetera ad infinitum*. (I, p. 121.) As a result of this unscrupulous traffic in spiritual benefits and of the theory that every ecclesiastical service had a money value, expressions of disgust arose all over Christendom. "The worst effect, however, was that the Papacy became more worldly than ever before in its history and largely neglected its spiritual obligations" (I, p. 179).

Even after the Avignon residence ended this feature of ecclesiastical rule continued and was a constant source of irritation. Loudest complaints against both bishops and popes were occasioned by financial abuses. "The dominating idea in the Papacy was not service, but power." And money meant power.

Another matter emphasized throughout these volumes is the veniality of the curia and the terrible moral corruption which permeated the church in every aspect of its life. Page after page has its picture of moral depravity and decadence reaching all the way from the Pope down to the lowest priest, of unrestricted vice in papal palace, monastery, and nunnery. Dr. Flick points out that, "in criticizing the clergy for immorality, the fact must be kept in mind that the general moral tone of Europe was very low and the temptations which beset

the priest were numerous" (II, p. 441 f.). Nevertheless, the church did little to raise the moral level, and the corruption among the clergy in this respect was a "most potent factor in arousing popular hatred against the ecclesiastical leaders high and low" (II, p. 472). The Reformation was the answer of the longing of the heart of many of the people for a loftier ideal of life.

It would be interesting and profitable to discuss at length other phases of the author's treatment of the negative forces making for decline. An able and comprehensive review is given of the great reforming councils. Dr. Flick finds in them the unifying and strengthening of the papal power and authority. Nevertheless,

"The general discussions and criticism both within and without the Church by the liberal, progressive, reform party struck at the very roots of the Papal system and the medieval dogma. Demands were made which, when not satisfied by the general councils, precipitated the Protestant movement." (II, p. 206.)

But we must pass to a brief word regarding the section on the Renaissance, comprising over two hundred and fifty pages. Dr. Flick discusses the outstanding positive forces that were lessening the leadership of the medieval church and speeding its dissolution. It is interesting to note, however, his emphasis, as indicated by the amount of space, on the economic and social revolution as a determining factor in the process. He says, "The social and economic revolution . . . was the greatest single factor undermining the power and prestige of the Medieval Church during the fifteenth century" (II, p. 397). The treatment of this aspect of the period is illuminating and convincing. Nevertheless, Dr. Flick recognizes that it was no one force, but a combination of many forces, "that produced the explosion" that led to the Protestant revolt, and he deals understandingly with each.

Mention should be made in closing of two excellent features of this work. One is the extensive bibliography for each chapter, which will be of great interest and value to the research

student. The chief primary and secondary sources both in English and in foreign languages are fully and carefully listed. Another is the summaries which occur at the close of many of the chapters, giving either a recapitulation of the material covered or the author's conclusions which the facts presented seem to justify.

A criticism which should in no way reflect on the real value of this work might be offered of the author's English style. His diction is lucid and appropriate, but his literary form sags at times under the weight of the facts presented. More could be desired in the way of a surer and smoother sentence structure, and of the lighter touch and literary grace which so distinguished the writing of the Schaffs and is too frequently lacking in the historian.

No library or student of church history should be without these splendid volumes, which, by the way, are most handsomely bound.

PAUL C. WARREN.

THE PROTESTANT ETHIC AND THE SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM ²

RELIGION AND ECONOMICS have dwelt for ages in fairly well separated fields. Occasional incursions have been made from time to time from either side. Remembering this, it is a great surprise to find a book which traces a genetic relation between the two, and it is especially surprising to find the ancestry of capitalism traced to Calvinism and Protestant ethics. Puritanism has been held responsible for many wrongs, but to be called the father of such children as capitalism and the modern industrial system is too much, even for the sturdiest representatives of the Protestant faith. Yet such is the thesis of Max Weber in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

The book is very small, less than 150 pages, but with the usual German thoroughness the author has included notes

² *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. By Max Weber. Translated by Talcott Parsons, Tutor in Economics, Harvard University. With a Foreword by R. H. Tawney. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1930. Pp. xii+296. Notes. Appendix.

which are much more extensive than the text. The Foreword by R. H. Tawney is an excellent abstract. The book is divided into two parts: The Problem and The Practical Ethics of the Ascetic Branches of Protestantism. Under the first part we find the significant titles: Religious Affiliation and Social Stratification, The Spirit of Capitalism, and Luther's Conception of Calling; and under the second: The Religious Foundations of Worldly Asceticism, Asceticism and the Spirit of Capitalism.

There are two things to be taken into consideration in approaching this volume. In the first place, its suggestiveness has already stimulated much discussion in Germany, and its influence is evident in many articles appearing in our own current literature. But more important than that is the fact that Max Weber was one of the most scholarly students of social science which Germany has produced. The wide reach of his studies in the history of economic and social problems enabled him to compare Occidental with Oriental and ancient with modern problems. It was the observation of the differences in culture which these studies brought to light that led him to seek for the cause.

"A product of modern European civilization, studying any problem of universal history, is bound to ask himself to what combination of circumstances the fact should be attributed that in Western civilization, and in Western civilization only, cultural phenomena have appeared which (as we like to think) lie in a line of development having universal significance and value" (p. 13).

This is the general proposition but more definitely he adds:

"It is hence our first concern to work out and to explain genetically the special peculiarity of Occidental rationalism, and within this field that of the modern Occidental form. Every such attempt at explanation must, recognizing the fundamental importance of the economic factor, above all take account of the economic conditions. But at the same time the opposite correlation must not be left out of consideration. For though the development of economic rationalism is partly dependent on rational technique and law, it is at the same time determined

by the ability and disposition of men to adopt certain types of practical rational conduct. . . . The magical and religious forces, and the ethical ideas of duty based upon them, have in the past always been among the most important formative influences on conduct." (P. 26 f.)

Here then is an authority on economics, a careful student of history, and a very practical statesman, who observes the difference between modern Occidental culture and all other cultural developments, who sets himself to the task of finding the reason for this difference. In his quest Professor Weber turns to Protestant theology and ethics. He deliberately declares in a note on a work by E. Troeltsch: "The author is principally concerned with the doctrines of religion, while I am interested rather in their practical results" (p. 188).

The author calls capitalism "the most fateful force in our modern life." He refers to Benjamin Franklin's *Advice to a Young Tradesman*, and his *Necessary Hints to Those That Would Be Rich* as documents of the spirit of capitalism "which contains what we are looking for in almost classical purity, and at the same time has the advantage of being free from all direct relationship to religion" (p. 48). From these documents he quotes at length instead of attempting a definition. But he does give a definition of capitalism when he says he will "define a capitalistic economic action as one which rests on the expectation of profit by the utilization of opportunities of exchange," and "a systematic utilization of goods or personal services as a means of acquisition." (P. 17 f.) In this latter definition we readily recognize the danger which capitalism has so far never been able to avoid. It is the danger which arises from bringing together on one level goods, or wealth in any of its forms, and personal services in a combined action which may result in the injury of those who render the service. Capitalism must ever face the alternative of giving goods or persons the priority.

We are more interested, however, in the linking of this with Protestantism. In the examination of the spirit of capitalism

two elements come under observation which point to this relation, or one element which expresses itself in two ways. Beginning with the workers, Professor Weber sees that capitalism demands speed which cannot be motivated in the laborer either by increased or diminished wages. Traditional conventions hold him within certain bounds. It takes religion to release him from the power of tradition. On the other hand the employer finds his enterprise a vocation and immerses his life in it, so that both the laborer and the capitalist have been transformed by Protestantism and given a new attitude toward industrial and economic life.

This is not new, but a new application of an old idea. We have long been aware that the spirit of Protestantism revolutionized the governments of Europe. The belief in predestination was set over against the political doctrine of the divine right of kings. George Bancroft, in his history of the United States, wrote: "Against the feudal aristocracy the plebeian reformer summoned the spotless nobility of the elect" (vol. III, p. 101). We had not, however, connected this same revolutionary power with economic life. It is to Calvin and Luther that Professor Weber turns for the doctrines which are bearing fruit in modern capitalism. The two doctrines which have been most potent are predestination and vocation. A careful study of these doctrines, as they are stated in the writings of the Reformers and the creeds of the churches, establishes their prominence in the thing which gave rise to Protestant ethics.

Weber's conclusion is: "One feels at once that this powerful expression of the Puritan's serious attention to this world, his acceptance of his life in the world as a task, could not possibly have come from the pen of a mediaeval writer" (p. 88).

And he says further:

"It was the power of religious influence, not alone, but more than anything else, which created the differences of which we are conscious today" (p. 89).

"We have continually to deal with aspects of the Reformation which must appear to the truly religious consciousness as incidental and even superficial. For we are merely attempting

to clarify the part which religious forces have played in forming the developing web of our specifically worldly modern culture, in the complex interaction of innumerable different historical factors." (P. 90.)

All of this is interesting to the student of church history. Unfortunately our church historians have limited their field too narrowly to the theological and missionary activities of the church. The causal relation of religion to the various activities and interests of life has not been sufficiently observed. In fact, church historians still write in the classic style instead of applying the methods of modern historians. No one can understand the history of the church without perceiving the action and reaction of social conditions upon different periods of its progress. Evangelism and missionary enterprises are closely related to the epochal movements of what we think of as secular history.

Attention is called to the fact that the old Catholic Church kept a strict watch on the faith of its leaders and members with little interference in matters of behavior. On the other hand, the Protestant church has persistently interfered in the manner of life of its members. In other words, Protestantism is more ethical and Roman Catholicism more doctrinal and liturgical. But it was just those ethical precepts concerning frugality and the use of time and industry, persistently inculcated by the Protestant leaders, which prepared the way for capitalism.

The author makes a fine concluding observation which is well worth giving:

"The modern man is in general, even with the best will, unable to give religious ideas a significance for culture and national character which they deserve" (p. 183).

In fact, this book abounds in passages which are worthy of quotation. It is full of matter which inspires thought and it is bound to lead to further investigation. Any thoughtful reader will find himself richly repaid by a study of this masterly work.

JAMES PALMER.

PSYCHOLOGIES OF 1930³

THIS BOOK is indispensable for anyone who desires to gain a clear survey of the entire field of the science of psychology as it existed in 1930. There are a number of surveys of this field by individuals and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in its new edition gives us such a survey by a few specialists; but the invaluable feature of this book is that it is not the work of one or two psychologists who endeavor to cover all the departments, but in the special departments the experts themselves present their work and their point of view. Hence the chapters are constructive and positive rather than critical and negative. One of the most interesting discoveries is the surprising way in which psychology has abandoned the leadership of the Behavioristic school, so popular from 1912 to 1925, and has returned from its independent break with consciousness, introspection, and psychological determinism to the fold of the psycho-somatic organism idea. Neither the *psyche* nor the *soma* has won a complete victory over the other. They have agreed to settle down to harmonious functioning in behalf of the organism.

The best way to give some idea of the changes which have taken place in the field of psychology during the years 1925 to 1930 is to place the Contents of the two volumes, *Psychologies of 1925* and *Psychologies of 1930*, side by side. The graphic picture of the part-divisions, chapters, and names of authors will serve to orient the whole subject. So we will adopt this method.

Table of Contents of Psychologies of 1925:

Part I. Schools of Behaviorism.

Chapters 1-3, by John B. Watson.

Chapter 4, by Walter S. Hunter.

Part II. Dynamic Psychology.

Chapter 5, by Robert S. Woodworth.

³ *Psychologies of 1930*. By twenty-four writers. Edited by Carl Murchison. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press. 1930. Pp. xx+497. Indexes. Portraits.

Part III. Gestalt.

Chapter 6, by Kurt Koffka.

Chapters 7-8, by Wolfgang Köhler.

Part IV. Purposive Groups.

Chapters 9-11, by Morton Prince.

Chapters 12-13, by William McDougall.

Part V. Reaction Psychology.

Chapters 14-16, by Knight Dunlap.

Part VI. Psychologies Called "Structural."

Chapters 17-19, by Madison Bentley.

Table of Contents of Psychologies of 1930:

Part I. Hormic Psychology.

Chapter 1, by William McDougall, Duke University.

Part II. "Act" or "Intentional" Psychology and Associationism.

Chapter 2, by G. S. Brett, University of Toronto.

Part III. Functional Psychology.

Chapter 3, by Harvey Carr, University of Chicago.

Part IV. Psychological Theories of those whose Training Background Was the Structuralism of E. B. Titchener.

Chapter 4, by Margaret Floy Washburn, Vassar College.

Chapter 5, by Madison Bentley, Cornell University.

Chapter 6, by Edwin G. Boring, Harvard University.

Chapter 7, by John Paul Nafe, Clark University.

Part V. Configurational Psychologies.

Chapter 8, by Wolfgang Köhler, University of Berlin.

Chapter 9, by Kurt Koffka, Smith College.

Chapter 10, by Friedrich Sander, University of Giessen.

Part VI. Russian Psychologies.

Chapter 11, by I. P. Pavlov, State Institute of Experimental Medicine, Leningrad.

Chapter 12, by Alexander L. Schniermann, Bekhterev's

Reflexological State Institute for Brain Researches,
Leningrad.

Chapter 13, by K. N. Kornilow, Moscow State University.

Part VII. Behaviorism.

Chapter 14, by Walter S. Hunter.

Chapter 15, by Albert P. Weiss, Ohio State University.

Part VIII. Reaction Psychology.

Chapter 16, by Knight Dunlap, The Johns Hopkins University.

Part IX. Dynamic Psychology.

Chapter 17, by Robert S. Woodworth, Columbia University.

Part X. "Factor" School of Psychology.

Chapter 18, by C. Spearman, University of London.

Part XI. Analytical Psychologies.

Chapter 19, by Pierre Janet, College of France.

Chapter 20, by J. C. Flugel, University of London.

Chapter 21, by Alfred Adler, Vienna.

Part XII. Some of the Problems Fundamental to All Psychology.

Chapter 22, by John Dewey, Columbia University.

Chapter 23, by Truman L. Kelley, Stanford University.

Chapter 24, by C. Spearman, University of London.

Chapter 25, by Leonard T. Troland, Harvard University.

When these two tables of Contents are compared, psychology in 1925 looks like a little private American enterprise divided up between six schools, whose founders held control of the whole situation. Whatever other activity there was in the field was not important enough to receive recognition. In the *Psychologies of 1930* the whole situation is altered. The international character of the science is strikingly apparent. And

the six schools are almost lost in the variety of experimental and theoretical activity, while the founders of these schools have had all they could do to hold their places in the psychological field. McDougall, by changing from the purposive group to what he calls hormic psychology, still survives with one chapter. Hunter, with his anthropomony, has stayed, with his position barely held. Knight Dunlap, with his reaction psychology, still stands alone with his space reduced from three chapters to one. Woodworth yet hangs on without a recruit, in his dynamic school. Koffka and Köhler, the configurationalists, who found a place in the American group of 1925, are a little more than holding their own, having made very definite contributions during the five years, and have one recruit, Professor Sander.

The most surprising change is in the field of Behaviorism, which was so full of promise in 1925. John B. Watson then was given first place in the book, and three chapters. In the *Psychologies of 1930* he does not even appear. Hunter, as has been said, is the only survivor of that group. There is, however, an interesting shift noted under this head in the biosocial psychology of Professor Weiss. This is a virtual surrender of the extreme biological position for a biosocial idea. The real contribution in the field of experimental Behavioristic psychology comes to us in the Russian psychologies with their materialistic dialectic.

The most characteristic change is to be seen in such a chapter as that by Professor Spearman, which describes A School to End Schools. In a similar way Professor Boring entitles his chapter Psychology for Eclectics, and Madison Bentley has A Psychology for Psychologists. It is evident that the day of the domination of the "school" in psychology is past. The separation and ignorance of different fields which once made schools flourish no longer exists. Today contacts are close, and the power of the individual pioneer has been broken. This fact is emphasized still more clearly by Part XII, where Some Problems Fundamental to All Psychology

are discussed by such leaders as John Dewey, Truman L. Kelley, C. Spearman, and Leonard T. Troland.

Another amazing change is seen in Part XI, Analytical Psychologies. In 1925 the two most original and vital psychologies were Behaviorism and Psycho-analysis. Behaviorism was accepted with open arms, and looked to with high hope for the future. Psycho-analysis was not even granted recognition as a psychology. But in 1930 Watson and his Behaviorism do not appear, while Psycho-analysis is given a very satisfactory place. This acceptance of analytical psychology by orthodox psychology restores consciousness, introspection, and psychological determinism to their former places in the functioning field.

In the year 1926 the reviewer wrote an article for THE BIBLICAL REVIEW entitled The Downfall of the Mechanistic Dynasty. At that time the downfall of this dynasty was not as evident to the average student as it is today. In the field of physical science, in the field of biology, in the field of sociology, and now in the field of psychology, its downfall is complete. There is no mistaking the trend of progress during the last five years, and the direction indicated for the future. This change offers priceless opportunities to theologians, philosophers, and psychologists working in the field of religion.

A very valuable companion book to *Psychologies of 1930* is *Readings in Psychology*, by Raymond Holder Wheeler, University of Kansas, with special readings by Harry Helson, Bryn Mawr College, Milton Metfessel, University of Southern California, and Thomas D. Cutsforth, University of Kansas (T. Y. Crowell Company). This book gives case work in concrete form and fills in with experimental material and description many of the important gaps which the nature of *Psychologies of 1930* made necessary. The student who has neither the time nor the necessity for extensive reading in this prolific field will find these two books giving very satisfactory general information.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

WHO MOVED THE STONE? ⁴

WHO MOVED THE STONE? is one of the most interesting and inspiring books upon the arrest, trial, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus that has been published in many years. And the great surprise is that it forces the reader to a reconsideration of the whole subject under pressure of facts that leave the empty tomb much more of a problem than it has been in the minds of most twentieth century Christians.

The treatment is so original and fresh that the reader longs to know who the author is. But this is a secret. He writes under an assumed name. Rumor has it that he is a very well known person who, for some reason, has chosen to conceal his identity. Most of the guesses about him are attempts to prove that he is a theologian, a lawyer, a politician, a statesman or a writer. One thing we are sure of is that he is a man who selects, dramatizes, and handles his material with the psychological power of a gifted author. And yet he does seem to have the peculiar interest of a government official. These two things contribute to the fascination of the book.

One hesitates to reveal to the reader any idea of the way the author treats his subject for fear it will lessen the enjoyment of reading the book. To give some idea of how the book came to be written and the revolutionary change which the study of the material wrought in the mind of the writer will add considerably to one's desire to read it. We give this at some length in the author's own words, for he puts the matter much better than anyone else could. He tells us that he always has had a very deep and even reverent regard for the Person of Jesus Christ, and as a young man he undertook a serious study of His life. This study was begun with the very definite feeling that His history rested upon very insecure foundations. He tells us that those who can go back to the late 'nineties will know very well his intellectual attitude. The higher

⁴ *Who Moved the Stone?* By Frank Morison. New York: The Century Co. 1930. Pp. viii+294.

critics were at work upon the life of Jesus, and the evolutionary ideas of the day made the miraculous unbelievable. With this little explanation we let the author tell the rest of his own story:

“Personally I did not attach anything like the same weight to the conclusions of the textual critics that I did to this fundamental matter of the miraculous. It seemed to me that purely documentary criticism might be mistaken, but that the laws of the universe should go back on themselves in a quite arbitrary and inconsequential manner seemed very improbable. Had not Huxley himself declared in a peculiarly final way that ‘miracles do not happen,’ while Matthew Arnold, with his famous gospel of ‘Sweet Reasonableness,’ had spent a great deal of his time in trying to evolve a non-miraculous Christianity?” (P. 5.)

Apparently our author was not entirely satisfied with Matthew Arnold’s work in this field, for he decided to write a book himself upon this subject. Instead of taking the whole life of Christ, he fastens upon the last seven days. This period has three reasons to commend it: First, it is remarkably free from the miraculous element; second, all of the Gospels devote much space to it, and, in the main, are in striking agreement; third, the trial and execution of Jesus is a historical event attested indirectly by a thousand political consequences and a vast literature which grew out of them. It seemed to him that, if he could find out why this man died a cruel death at the hands of the Roman power, how He Himself regarded the matter, and especially how He behaved under the test, he would come very near solving the problem of the real Jesus back of the Gospel stories.

Ten years passed, and an opportunity came for him to study the life of Christ, to investigate the origins of its literature, to sift some of the evidence at first hand, and to form his own judgments on the problems presented. This study and these investigations wrought a revolution in his thinking. He says:

“Slowly but very definitely the conviction grew that the drama of those unforgettable weeks of human history was

stranger and deeper than it seemed. It was the *strangeness* of many notable things in the story which first arrested and held my interest. It was only later that the irresistible logic of their meaning came into view.

"I want to try, in the remaining chapters of this book, to explain why that other venture never came to port, what were the hidden rocks upon which it foundered, and how I landed upon, to me, an unexpected shore." (P. 8.)

We have given the author's experience, which resulted from a serious investigation of the facts and "submerged facts" in the Gospels, because we know how this sort of thing can work a revolution in one's whole attitude toward the Jesus of the Gospels. The reviewer passed through almost the same experience and has been giving the results of it in a class study course for several years, working over the material for publication. He has been wondering why someone did not happen upon the same experience and publish it. So that the appearance of this book does not come to him as a surprise. Its reading, however, will serve to make easier the understanding of the book he hopes to publish. For it deals with a different selection of material.

It should be noted that the question of the title, *Who Moved the Stone?* is the least important feature in the study. The arrest, trial, crucifixion, and empty tomb, are the points of interest around which the author's real contributions center. It is quite possible for one to reject entirely the answer to this question which the author gives without in the least impairing the value of the major contributions of the book. We are sure that the writer is not a Greek scholar; or, if he is, we know that he did not use his knowledge of Greek in his study of his sources, for he would not have made so much of the similarity of words and phrases which happen to be the same in the translation, but not in the original Greek. But these points also are minor, and of no serious consequence. The book itself is stimulating and constructive.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

THE PROPHETIC PROSPECTS OF THE JEWS⁵

IN THE YEAR 1840 a book appeared in Glasgow, Scotland, entitled *A Course of Lectures on the Jews*. One of these dealt with the Future Prospects of the Jews. Its author was Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, pastor of Bridgeton Parish, a man in his early thirties, but even then recognized as a prominent theologian. What those prospects were he felt capable of explaining, and with a cogency that charms the reader he proceeded to develop his thesis. Its aftermath, recently exploited, is highly instructive.

Starting with the assumption that prophecies already fulfilled in the history of the Jewish people are the surest guide in the matter, he goes on to say that, "if in the one part the fulfilment that has taken place be unquestionably a literal one, we must look for a literal fulfilment in the other also; or if, through means of a figure, an event of a certain description was in the earlier part of it clearly predicted concerning them, by a change afterwards introduced into that figure, we are to look only for a corresponding change in their condition, in process of time to be developed, not for an event, in which they have no peculiar or special interest at all" (p. 16).

He thus makes it clear that he believes in the literal interpretation of the prophecies and that the Jews will yet be in a dominating position. His first proposition is that "the Jews as a people, shall again become the people of God; which of course implies, that they shall be converted to the faith of Christ, becoming in one vast body members of the Christian church" (p. 20).

His next proposition is, that "the Jewish people shall be restored to their ancient territory—the land of Canaan. It shall again become theirs. . . . in perpetual possession." (P. 32.) He sustains his thesis with frequent citations from

⁵ *The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews: Or Fairbairn vs. Fairbairn.* By Rev. Patrick Fairbairn. With Introduction by the Rev. Albertus Pieters, D.D., Dosker-Hulswit Professor of English Bible and Missions, Western Theological Seminary, Holland, Michigan. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 1930. Pp. 179.

the Scriptures and adds footnotes at various points to enforce his views. His general position is thus similar to that presented by Dr. Gaebelein, in the issue of *THE BIBLICAL REVIEW* for July, 1930.

In due time this same Patrick Fairbairn became a professor in the Free Church College, and some twenty-five years after his first paper was published he publishes a book on prophecy. In this there is a chapter entitled *The Prophetical Future of the Jewish People*. From that chapter it is clear that his mind was not entirely at rest concerning his original conclusions; for he deliberately and completely answers and destroys his first position, recognizing that it depicted the expectations of the Jews, but did not meet all the requirements of the situation.

Those expectations include a gathering of the Jewish people by their Messiah, the restoration of their ancient territory, the rebuilding of the temple, the restoration of its worship, and the political hegemony of their race. Not a few Christians accept this view at its face value, just as the youthful Fairbairn did. Others, as he says, accept it in part, while still others reject both positions and hold that the prophecy is to be made good by the conversion of the Jews "to the Christian faith, and their participation in the privileges and hopes of the church of Christ" (p. 91).

There are thus three modes of interpretation, "the Jewish, the semi-Jewish, and the spiritualistic." Of the latter he says:

"Taking up their position on distinctively gospel principles, and contemplating all that is written in Old Testament Scripture of gospel times primarily in a New Testament light, they apply *uniformly* one and the same rule of interpretation to the prophecies which bear on the future of the covenant-people. What it obliges them to hold in respect to the religion and the more distinguishing peculiarities of Israel, they feel constrained to hold also in respect to their land and polity." (P. 94.)

Their position, he says, is based on passages which seem to leave no other method of interpretation. Over against them

are other passages which appear to support an opposite view. That makes it necessary to discriminate between "parts of Scripture which relate to the *foundations* of God's kingdom, which fix and determine the *form* as well as the *substance* of things belonging to it, and those which, from being of a subsidiary nature, relate only to what may be fit or practicable within the settled landmarks" (p. 95 f.).

The direct teaching of our Lord and His apostles thus becomes a necessary part of the problem; the outlook is no longer that of Moses, but that of Christ. If Moses was not subordinate to the prophets, but superior to them, how much more so was Christ? The present expectations of the Jews find no encouragement in the New Testament, and that is a vital element in the problem. The Kingdom is not an earthly one dominated by force, but a spiritual one based on love. He shows further that a literal interpretation of some portions of the prophecies is a historical impossibility. Taken altogether, this second portion of the book is a remarkable illustration of what genuine research work on a critical basis can do to change a man's views. As to which part of the book is the more trustworthy, the presumption must lie with the part that rests on mature judgment rather than on a young man's zeal and a surface view of things. As a help in deciding the question, it may be remarked that the Greek of Matthew 26:64 does not mean that a future generation shall behold Christ sitting on the "right hand of Power," but that those then and there present were to behold it from that very instant; for the two words do not mean hereafter but from now on, from the present moment. Such items have been too long neglected in Biblical matters.

Two things stand out conspicuously in reading the book: First, its author must have read extensively along these lines; and, second, he was but little influenced by what he read and did his own thinking. The earmarks of originality can be found on almost every page. For that reason no bibliography should be expected, and there is none. He does not restate what others

have said, but gives his own convictions from an intensive study of the original sources. An index would have been a helpful addition to the book, but there is none. In spite of that fact, the book is an extremely useful one in this way—it sums up in admirable fashion the most cogent arguments on both sides of the question and leaves the reader to decide for himself what is the truth.

H. W. MAGOUN.

D. L. MOODY⁶

WILLIAM R. MOODY, son of Dwight L. Moody, has written a life of his father, under the simple title, *D. L. Moody*, which is far and away the most authoritative, readable, and exhaustive of the many biographies of the great evangelist. It is written with candor and in the historical spirit. Although the writer must have had abundant material gained from his own personal experience and observation, yet this volume covers a much wider range than the reminiscences of a son. The Bibliography, consisting of books, pamphlets, and newspapers consulted, covers six pages. Altogether it is to be questioned whether so satisfactory an account of this great winner of souls and builder of schools will ever again appear.

In a recent notable contribution to American biography made by James Truslow Adams, entitled *The Adams Family*, the author makes the observation that this early American family lived along in colonial times for four generations as "simple but public spirited yeomen," and then suddenly the farmer's son of one of them became President of the United States, and his descendants became outstanding leaders in either the intellectual or political life of the country for five generations.

In a similar way the Moody family dates back to John Moody, who, at the age of forty, came to Roxbury in 1633. For six generations Moody's ancestral line plodded on until it reached Edwin Moody, father of Dwight. He was a brick

⁶ *D. L. Moody*. By William R. Moody. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 556. Bibliography. Index. Illustrations.

mason by trade, and our author calls him "improvident." Then, with the advent of Dwight L. Moody, to borrow an expression from *The Adams Family*, "there is a sudden and immense rise recorded in the psychical energy of the family." This new energy appears mainly in the achievements of Dwight L. Moody, but has honorably projected itself also into the present generation.

In the biography under consideration one is impressed by the fact that Mr. Moody's life was marked by a number of momentous departures from courses he had been following. He was unusually amenable to the Spirit's guidance, and this led to many ventures of faith. The space allotted to this review may possibly be used to the best advantage by referring to some of the great decisions Moody made. The first of these was to abandon business for Christian work. This came after an experience in Chicago with a class of girls in a Sunday School of which he was superintendent. The joy of seeing them all converted was something entirely new in his life. He knew at once that this had important consequences for him, and the decision it led to cost no small effort.

"By special commissions, in addition to his regular salary, Moody had an income at this time of more than five thousand dollars, a splendid beginning for a youth of only twenty-four" (p. 67).

"The struggle ended as anyone who knew Moody could have foreseen. If once convinced of duty to God there was no compromise. He resigned from business to become a non-descript, independent city missionary." (P. 68.)

Parenthetically, it may be stated here that Moody did not accept any of the innumerable opportunities that came to him, in connection with his great popularity, to make money. He and Sankey placed in the hands of a committee of trustees profits from the sale of the Moody and Sankey hymn books, with instructions to use such funds for religious or charitable purposes according to their discretion (p. 202). It may not be too much to say that the evangelist, by proper investment of funds, honestly his, could have amassed a fortune. Although

over a million dollars was received from his royalties and used for the purposes of the Kingdom, he died in very modest circumstances (p. 468).

Moody's work was first among children, and he built up a Sunday School which sometimes reached an attendance of 1500; but eventually he realized that it was not enough to get the child. "You work," said he, "against great odds, unless you can get someone in the home to help the child." Eventually a union church was organized, but the matter of a creed caused trouble.

"After repeated sessions of the group assigned to the task of drawing up a creed, a happy solution was found in so framing the confession of faith as to confine it to the words of Scripture itself. Any dissident would then be taking issue not with any sectarian opinions but with the Bible." (P. 99.)

"Twenty-five years after Moody had passed from his labors, the church, having grown out of its humble beginning erected the 'Moody Memorial Church,' an imposing edifice with a seating capacity for over four thousand" (p. 100).

A significant change in Moody's thinking and preaching came when he heard Harry Moorehouse preach seven consecutive sermons on God's love, with John 3:16 as the text of each sermon. Moody's wife had characterized Moorehouse' preaching by the remark, "He tells the worst sinners that God loves them." To this Moody had replied, "Then he is wrong." But when Moody later described his impressions of Moorehouse, he said, "This heart of mine began to thaw out; I could not keep back the tears." In this connection his son says, "This experience supplied the 'wooing note' which had been largely missing from Moody's sermons up to this time" (p. 118 ff.).

In the spring of 1867 Mr. Moody made his first trip to England, "to equip himself more fully for service." Among other things, he wanted to meet George Williams, founder of the Young Men's Christian Association. He himself was leader of the Chicago Association. He also wanted to meet George Müller. Unexpectedly he was drawn into an effort to establish daily prayer-meetings in London and elsewhere, in

which he was signally successful. However, it was not until his next visit, in 1870, that his real evangelistic career in the British Isles began. The remarkable way in which this campaign started is a story that has often been told. As it is here told again it is clearly not apocryphal.

One section of the volume is given to an interesting account of the beginnings of Northfield Seminary and Mount Hermon:

"On one occasion he drove with his brother Samuel to a distant pasture to see some cattle. Returning home they passed a humble cabin, far up in the mountains. Sitting in the doorway were the mother and three daughters who eked out a meager existence by plaiting straw hats. The father was a helpless paralytic. Stopping by the wayside the two brothers entered into conversation with the cripple and his family whose intelligence and simple Christian faith impressed Moody." (P. 303.)

That incident suggested the educational need of poor but deserving girls in that section, and out of that idea eventually came Northfield Seminary. When Moody was besought to found a school for boys he demurred. But, when a philanthropist offered to give a substantial sum to start such a school, he accepted this additional burden of care and responsibility, and Mount Hermon was established.

There is a description of the origin of the Chicago Bible Institute, which was afterward to bear Moody's name, and its founder's aim is given in this passage:

"Moody was at great pains to explain in the religious press and from the platform his purpose in founding this institution. It was not an implied affront to theological seminaries, for Moody again affirmed his belief in a trained ministry and was opposed to short cuts to the pulpit. This school was established for young men and young women of mature years and with the equivalent of a high school education, whose circumstances did not permit them to pursue a regular course of study in other institutions of learning, to equip themselves for Christian service. Primarily he had in mind men and women already experienced in life, feeling impelled to enter home or foreign missionary work as lay workers. For such he felt there was need of a thorough training in the Bible, accompanied by

practical Christian service, the opportunities for which are amply afforded in a great city. The burden was probably the greatest Moody ever undertook. Even when he was called to lay down his life work he did not feel that he had yet achieved the end for which he had labored. To be sure he lived to see success attained numerically, but this was not his measure in Christian service. Shortly before his going he referred to 'his whistling through the woods' when asked about the work of the Chicago Bible Institute." (P. 373.)

It is not possible within the limits of this review to reproduce the many characterizations and estimates of Moody quoted by the author. Suffice it to say that they are very interesting. None of the explanations of his amazing success which are cited seem entirely adequate. They were written by contemporaries, and it may require the perspective of another generation to understand the power of this uneducated man who appealed so strongly to the greatest minds of England and America, as well as to the common people.

In any balanced and satisfactory estimate of D. L. Moody it seems fairly probable that there must be included the remarkable sanity of his mind issuing in an almost unerring judgment. One of the most attractive features of this volume is the number of concrete cases in which, when called upon to decide quickly either in a major or minor situation, Moody seemed to display the wisdom of a Solomon or perhaps such a combination of such wisdom with humor as marked so many decisions of Abraham Lincoln. He could not be prevailed upon to start a Northfield missionary society. He thought too highly of the constituted agencies already in that field. Much less could he approve a proposal to start a new denomination. In conversation with General Booth he condemned the weakness of the sacramental position of the Salvation Army. He would espouse no fads.

"So-called faith missions he viewed with a certain degree of misgiving. He believed that all missions were essentially maintained by faith, and to publish and constantly reiterate that any particular mission depended upon prayer and the voluntary gifts of Christians constituted in itself an appeal.

To stress the point that there was no appeal was but an astute method of soliciting." (P. 381.)

In fine, one may venture the assertion that William R. Moody, in giving the world this vivid pen portrait of his father, has not only performed a task congenial to his filial soul, but that he has rendered a distinct service to thousands of Christian men and women.

FREDERICK W. LEWIS.

MAHATMA GANDHI—HIS OWN STORY ⁷

THE EDITOR of *Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story*, C. F. Andrews, an old friend of Gandhi and an English missionary, is well qualified. Abundant material made his task difficult, but within 368 pages he has given us an attractive view of this most striking of India's leaders. It will be well to read the Introduction by John Haynes Holmes as the conclusion of the book, for it carries the story on to the present time, and does not sum it up, as does the book, with "my life has been so public from this on that there is hardly anything about it that the people do not know," an assumption that is not true for the United States. It seems to the reviewer that the Editor should not have allowed this assumption to pass unchallenged.

The father of M. Gandhi was in political life, as Prime Minister, though he belonged to the Bania, or trader, caste. The mother was an extremely devout woman, who would never think of taking her meals without her daily prayers and a daily visit to the temple, while religious fasting was her common practice. As the youngest child, he must have been much with her and have accompanied her to the temple. She instilled into him a deep devotion to truth. His autobiography, published in India in two volumes and bound in *khaddar*, or homespun, has the title, *My Experiments with Truth*.

Born on October 2, 1869, Gandhi is now in his sixty-second year, and the most influential leader in India. He cannot re-

⁷ *Mahatma Gandhi—His Own Story*. Edited by C. F. Andrews. With an Introduction by John Haynes Holmes. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1930. Pp. 372. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index.

call having ever told a lie in his early school days. However, he had a friend whom he set out to reform and discovered, eventually, that "man far more readily takes in vice than virtue," and he himself became corrupted and led off into the deadly sins of meat eating and lying. Petty thieving, smoking, a half-hearted attempt at suicide, and other evils were all the outgrowth of this "reforming" friendship; but seeing the evil outcome of lying Gandhi gave up meat and the other sins and confessed his lying to his father.

He was married at the age of thirteen, a father at sixteen, and at eighteen left for England to secure training as a lawyer, leaving his wife with a son of a few months, the first child having died. Before his mother gave her consent to his going he took an oath to abstain from wine, women, and meat, which he kept, though abstinence from meats caused him no little trouble.

In due time he passed his law examinations and returned to India where he opened a law office in Bombay. Here, however, he was not able to make both ends meet, so he returned to Rajkot, where his family was living and there earned about \$100 a month.

When an offer to go to South Africa to look after the interests of a firm of Moslem traders was made to him, the prospects of his law business were so poor that he was glad to go. A claim of forty thousand pounds sterling, which he went out to settle, was finally determined by arbitration to be thirty-seven thousand and costs. Both parties remained friends, and Gandhi learned that law goes with the facts, and that the true practice of law is to find out the better side of human nature and unite parties driven asunder.

His public work for the laborers from India and his success in prosecuting cases built him up a large practice in South Africa, and he was on the way to large wealth. He devoted himself, however, to ameliorating the condition of his fellow countrymen there, and was instrumental in helping them in many ways and in getting better political conditions for them.

He loyally helped the British during the Boer War, the Zulu Rebellion, and the Great War; for he conceived that through the British Empire India was likely to gain the greatest advantages. However, when the Rowlatt Act and the Amritsar tragedy convinced him that he could not expect justice for India from British rulers, he joined issue, in his first nonco-operation campaign, with his rulers and was finally put in jail. He recognized the failure of this movement, and after his release he set about to educate the people to engage in a real campaign of nonviolent nonco-operation. When he felt the time ripe he demanded that by January 1, 1930, India should be granted self-government. This not being done, he again started a civil disobedience movement and centered his disobedience on breaking the law against producing salt from evaporating sea water. He was again put in jail as an instigator of rebellious practices. But even so, he wields a tremendous influence in the political thought and action of India.

Let us note further, as we get it from his own story, his religious and political development up to the present time. Religiously, Gandhi is a Hindu, but of a type which is the outgrowth of Western thought and Hindu philosophy. He had an early dislike of Christianity, and, although he came in contact with some eminent examples of the Christian faith and pays tribute to their excellence, he believed in an undying soul in all animals, and in the possibility of man's working out his own salvation. Certainly many things are told of Gandhi's life which show him as a marvelous exponent of many of the principles taught by our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount. Such teachings can also be found in some of the Hindu sages, and through following this active "passive resistance," Gandhi was able to secure the abolition of South African laws which bore heavily on the Indian laborers.

He gives three moderns credit for greatly influencing him. The first was a Hindu business man, Raychand, whose motto was, "I shall think myself blessed only when I see God in every one of my daily acts." The second was Tolstoy, through his

The Kingdom of God is Within You, and the third was Ruskin, through his *Unto this Last*, which, he says, "brought about an instantaneous and practical transformation in my life." He seems never to have found anyone who impressed him as a better man than himself, and of many Christians he could say that they were much worse than he would permit himself to be.

Politically he is most interesting as an advocate of non-violent nonco-operation, or as he calls it, *satyagraha*, soul force, not physical force. It is by this weapon that he hopes to win *swaraj*, self-rule for India. His success in South Africa encouraged him to try the same thing, by the same means, in India, but nonviolence speedily gave way to violence, and Gandhi took upon himself the blame for this evil and spent many days in fasting, reminding one of how some of the Old Testament prophets bore the sins of their people.

The book is a strong call to Christians to show all men a higher type of Christian virtue, so that we may be able to say with Paul, "Follow me, as I follow Christ."

THOMAS F. CUMMINGS.